CLASSICAL ARCHAEOLOGY: THE BRYN MAWR TRADITION

Brunilde S. Ridgway

Interviewed by Richard Cándida Smith and Claire L. Lyons

Art History Oral Documentation Project

Compiled under the auspices
of the
Getty Research Institute for the History of
Art and the Humanities

Copyright ©1998
The J. Paul Getty Trust

COPYRIGHT LAW

The copyright law of the United States (Title 17, United States Code) governs the making of photocopies or other reproductions of copyrighted material. Under certain conditions specified in the law, libraries and archives are authorized to furnish a photocopy or other reproduction. One of these specified conditions is that the photocopy or reproduction is not to be used for any purpose other than private study, scholarship, or research. If a user makes a request for, or later uses, a photocopy or reproduction for purposes in excess of "fair use," that user may be liable for copyright infringement. This institution reserves the right to refuse to accept a copying order if, in its judgment, fulfillment of the order would involve violation of copyright law.

RESTRICTIONS ON THIS INTERVIEW

None.

LITERARY RIGHTS AND QUOTATION

This manuscript is hereby made available for research purposes only. All literary rights in the manuscript, including the right to publication, are reserved to the Getty Research Institute for the History of Art and the Humanities. No part of the manuscript may be quoted for publication without the written permission of the Assistant Director for Resource Collections of the Getty Research Institute for the History of Art and the Humanities.

* * *

Frontispiece: Brunilde S. Ridgway, 1997. Photograph by Larry Kesterson, courtesy of Brunilde S. Ridgway and the Office of Public Information, Bryn Mawr College, Bryn Mawr, Pennsylvania..

CONTENTS

Curriculum Vitae xiii

SESSION ONE: 26 MARCH, 1997 (170 minutes)

TAPE I, SIDE ONE 1

Family background — Father a career officer in the Italian military — Eight years in Ethiopia and Eritrea, 1938–1945 — A permanent loss of hearing as a result of bombing raids — Escaping to Asmara — Father a prisoner of war in Kenya for forty months — Learning English while working as a secretary in the customs office of the British occupation government in Asmara — Returning to Italy in 1945 — Settling in Messina — Return to school after a five-year interruption — With tutors and self-motivation, five years of schooling accomplished in five months — Enrolling in *lettere classiche* at the University of Messina — Dissertation for *laurea* written on English masques — Summer spent at Stratford-on-Avon — Applies for fellowship to spend one year studying archaeology at Bryn Mawr College — Decision to extend studies and earn a Ph.D. from Bryn Mawr — Classes in archaeology at Messina with Giulio Jacopi — No contact with other archaeologists in Italy before leaving for the United States — Jacopi's reputation as a Nazi collaborator — His courses on Polykleitos, Myron, and Pheidias — Using fascicles by Ranuccio Bianchi-Bandinelli — Ridgway's disinterest in current affairs and politics — Attention focused on the ancient world — Studies in philosophy in high school — Religious faith — Courses in Greek epigraphy — Archaeology in Italy was primarily a study of ancient art — Character sketch of Rhys Carpenter — M.A. thesis focused on arranging the kouroi and korae in the Bryn Mawr collection into a chronological order using stylistic analysis alone and ignoring all previous scholarship — Carpenter's eloquent lecture style.

TAPE I, SIDE TWO 26

Seminar with Carpenter on Hellenistic sculpture — Tutorials with Carpenter — Classes with Mary Hamilton Swindler and Machteld

Mellink — Mellink's teaching style friendly but impersonal — Mellink's seminar on Crete — Only two other graduate students in the Bryn Mawr archaeology program in the mid-1950s: Anne Ashmead and Miriam Ervin Caskey — Attending lectures by Denys Page — Ridgway meets her future husband at square dances held at the University of Pennsylvania — Her husband's strict Quaker upbringing — Ridgway's family upset with prospect of her marrying an American — Three months in Sicily to allow the romance to cool off — Difficulties with U.S. immigration because Fulbright fellows not allowed to enter the country with the intention of getting married — Settling into teaching and raising a family — Developing friendships with the archaeology programs at Princeton and the University of Pennsylvania — Meeting Margarete Bieber — Two years at the American School in Athens before getting married — Teaching at the Italian Institute of Culture in Athens — Sole excavating experience under the direction of Doro Levi at Phaestos — Studying architectural history at the American School under W. B. Dinsmoor — Classes with Gorham Phillips Stevens and Bert Hodge Hill — Eugene Vanderpool — Alexander Cambitoglou quarrel's with Ridgway's English — Mellink's advice on English style — Carpenter retired and was not present at Ridgway's dissertation defense — Differences between faculty-student relations in Italian and American universities — Carpenter encouraged students to think through problems and take independent stands — Carpenter's insistence on "using one's eyes" instead of relying on previous scholarship — Learning how to see the difference between severe and severizing sculpture — Preference for sculpture and architecture over vase painting — Classes in linguistics in Italy emphasized etymology over language structures — Growing recognition in archaeology during the past thirty years of how little is known about the ancient world — New discoveries about the *meniskoi*: returning to issues that many archaeologists had once thought were completely settled — Training in Roman, Egyptian, and Near Eastern archaeology — Questions that led to *Roman Copies of Greek Sculpture* — More on excavating under Doro Levi — No patience for the practice of excavation — Evelyn Harrison's vast knowledge of sculpture — Hard times making ends meet during first years at Bryn Mawr — Anne Hanson and Ridgway traded Italian lessons for babysitting — Publishing not a major issue at Bryn Mawr.

TAPE II, SIDE ONE 52

Working conditions at Bryn Mawr in late 1950's and early 1960's — — Ridgway not allowed to take junior leave or sabbaticals because they would interfere with Mellink's excavation trips — Ridgway given one week maternity leave when her sons were born — Criticized for having too many children, which might interfere with her teaching obligations — College administration not sympathetic to problems of junior faculty — Archaeology faculty at Bryn Mawr — Ridgway taught introductory survey course, Greek and Roman sculpture — Joint teaching seminars with Gloria Pinney, Carl Nylander and Robert Fleischer — Lively interaction between students and professors at Bryn Mawr — Graduate program expansion in the sixties — Balancing family life and a full-time teaching job — Husband shared home and childcare responsibilities — His support made her scholarly career possible — Husband's work in physical therapy and rehabilitation — Heavy teaching load at Bryn Mawr — Comparison of academic opportunities for women in Italy and the U.S. — Never thought of herself as building a career, she was just doing what she liked doing best — Honor system and high standards of scholarship at Bryn Mawr — Ridgway a role model for her students — Relations with undergraduate students in the sixties — Campus antiwar protests very peaceful — The Ridgways' involvement with civil rights and antiwar movements — Ridgway's four sons.

TAPE II, SIDE TWO 78

Ridgway's youngest son nearly died at five months and became disabled — Strained relations with her middle children — Ridgway criticized for being too strong-willed, but family always came first for her — Relief that her grandchildren are boys — Tendency to treat students as if they were an extension of her family — More on working conditions at Bryn Mawr — Bryn Mawr ranked as having the lowest salaries of its class of college — Many Bryn Mawr graduates sent to the University of Michigan.

SESSION TWO: 27 MARCH, 1997 (165 minutes)

TAPE III, SIDE ONE..86

Reviewing daily and weekly routines while at Bryn Mawr — Impossibility of working at home — Living on campus and hiring a live-in nanny helped make academic work possible — Books were written during sabbaticals — Articles and essays largely developed from expanding points sketched out in lectures given in class and at conferences — *The Severe Style in Greek Sculpture* completed during six months stay at the Institute for Advanced Study — The problem leading to Ridgway's article "The Date of the So-called Lysippean Jason" — Examing the sculpture from the side convinced her that the piece was more typical of Roman illusionism than the period of Lysippos — Thinking through the transposition of Greek religious styles into Roman secular uses — Resistance to Ridgway's ideas — Nikolaus Himmelmann's studies of the Sperlonga sculptures — Focus should be on working through archaeological problems collectively rather than forcing one's own solutions — Carpenter's advice on writing and lecturing — Learning how to lecture from slides without notes — Friendships formed with Italian archaeologists in Athens — "Notes on the Development of the Greek Frieze" written in honor of W. B. Dinsmoor — Influence of Humfry Payne's work on the Akropolis korai — Developing the argument and structure of *The Severe Style in Greek Sculpture* (1970) — Thinking through the effects of architectural scale on sculptural production — Using stylistic analysis to theorize increased use of clay models — The subjective limitations of stylistic analysis — Discussions with Werner Fuchs at the Institute for Advanced Study over the place of ethos and spirit in archaeological analysis — Convinced that it is impossible ever to know the "Greek mind" — Misconceptions about the role of Greek women in antiquity — Criteria for choosing monuments to examine in *The Severe Style*.

TAPE III, SIDE TWO..110

Ridgway's critique of attribution theories — Arguing for the legitimacy of sculpture in archaeology — Working on *Hellenistic Sculpture 1: The Styles of ca. 331–200 B.C.* at CASVA — Disagreements with Henry Millon over her conviction that dating had to precede

interpretation of meaning — On her article "The Setting of Greek Sculpture" — Struggling to distinguish Hellenistic and Roman style by thinking through how the sculpture might have been displayed — How teaching can lead to fresh approaches to long held assumptions in archaeology — Differences with Evelyn Harrison over interpretations and methodologies — Disagreement over the Parthenon Nike — Advising the sculptor of the Nashville Parthenon — Important lessons learned from Nashville — Responsibilities of archaeologists to help make such projects as accurate as possible — New evidence from the Athenian Agora supports Ridgway's hypothesis that the extended arm of the Parthenon Athena had been cantilevered and had no column support — Reconstructing the decoration of the sandals for the Nashville replica — New propositions on dating in "A Story of Five Amazons" not accepted by most scholars — The evidence needed to confirm her hypotheses on Roman copies — More scholars are coming to accept her argument that Roman copies were not necessarily faithful to the Greek originals — Conviction that Romans were more interested in creating works that had meaning for them — Admiration for Mark Fullerton's work — Comparison of her position with that advanced by Margarete Bieber — Other archaeologists' initial lack of enthusiasm for *Roman Copies* — The debates over the dating of the Riace bronzes — Carol Mattusch's position on the bronzes — Technology may provide a solution to dating controversies — Evaluations of the Getty Kouros — Emotionalism interferes with rational assessment of evidence — Ilse Kleemann's arguments at the Getty Kouros Colloquium — Ridgway feels Getty Kouros is authentic, but defers to other scholars who she feels know the period better and are more skeptical than she — Inconclusive evidence provided by technological analysis.

TAPE IV, SIDE ONE.. 135

The conflicting evidence that practicing sculptors brought to the Getty Kouros controversy — Writing *Fifth Century Styles in Greek Sculpture* while on leave as visiting professor at the University of Pittsburgh — More on experience at the Institute for Advanced Study — How Ridgway planned and developed a sequence of books surveying the major periods of Greek sculpture — Structure and organization of *Fourth Century Styles in Greek Sculpture* — Response to accusations that she tries to be "original at all costs" and she

"publishes her lecture notes" — Identification of costumes of korai can aid in interpretations of what the figure represents — Work of Judith Schaeffer and Gloria Pinney on this topic — On her article "The State of Research on Ancient Art" — A furious response from art historians — Stylistic analysis as practiced in archaeology and in art history — Reviewing the work of Luigi Todisco in her article "The Study of Classical Sculpture at the End of the Twentieth Century" — Citing Mieke Bal and Norman Bryson — Appreciation for Gloria Ferrari Pinney's use of semiotics as congruent with the observable facts — Disagreement with of Andrew Stewart's reading of the Nike of Samothrace — Critique of reception theory as applied to the study of Greek sculpture — "Every reader in making an interpretation reads his own mind and not that of the ancients" — Using semiotics to understand Greeks' system of symbols — On the work of Joan Reilly and Joan Connelly — No current theory of the Parthenon frieze answers all the questions it must answer to be correct — Disagreement with Connelly's reading of the youthful figure handling the peplos: it cannot be a female — Thoughts on Andrew Stewart's work on gender and sexuality — The objectivity of stylistic categories — Comparing her approach to reading sculpture to that of Gisela Richter — "Ancient Greek Women and Art: The Material Evidence" came out of a conference on women as sponsors — Disagreements with approaches of New Archaeology — Never begins a project with a theory that she wants to confirm — More on why Ridgway became an archaeologist.

TAPE IV, SIDE TWO 159

The value of archaeology as an undergraduate major — Archaeology teaches students how to think rationally and how to present a case — Ridgway's experience as a juror on a criminal case proves the value of archaeological method for everyday modern life — She was the only juror who could easily distinguish fact from theory — Ridgway's plans for future books: second- and first-century Greek sculpture, and her memoirs — Little interest in twentieth-century art and culture, but does respond to Brancusi — Loves Eskimo sculpture — On the "Ridgway Rangers" — Comparing her teaching style to Carpenter's — Lively intellectual exchanges with Carl Nylander, Kyle Phillips, and Gloria Pinney — Strengths and weaknesses of Kyle Phillips — Correspondence with family in Italy — In spite of attractive outside offers and many difficulties of Bryn Mawr situation, Ridgway could

never bring herself to leave.

SESSION THREE: 28 MARCH, 1997 (130 minutes)

TAPE V, SIDE ONE........173

On her writing output — More on extensive teaching responsibilities at Bryn Mawr — Never worked with a research assistant — Work on the Piombino Apollo in the Louvre, and the Porticello Head — Her dating, based entirely on stylistic analysis, was disputed by nearly all other scholars but confirmed by excavation of underwater context — Viewing the Sperlonga grotto with Gisela Richter and Baldassare Conticello — Appointment as editor of *AJA* in 1977 — Changes in editorial policy — Developing a work team to put out the journal — Assistants Tamara Stech and Alice Donohue — Special issue in honor of Richard Stillwell — Rethinking the boundaries of the journal's coverage — Changing book review policies to make the reviews more inclusive — Differences with some of Fred Kleiner's editorial decisions for *AJA* — The difficulties of expanding into Byzantine archaeology — Relations with the AIA board — Defining the readership constituencies and their different interests — Encouraged to do more anthropology, but had to edit out the jargon — Comparison with other archaeological journals — High opinion of the *Journal of Roman Archaeology* — Value of review articles to solicit participation by senior scholars — Developing regional newsletters — Excavation reports seen as crucial component of *AJA* — AIA's policy decision to ban first publication of objects with uncertain provenance after cutoff date of 1972 — Difficulties in getting museums to cooperate with the AIA policy — Consulting for the Turkish government on the authenticity of an object bought by the Boston Museum of Fine Arts that Turkey claimed had been illegally exported — Carlos Picón's role at the Metropolitan — Friendship with Jirí Frel — Favorite museums — Importance of seeing architectural sculpture in its proper context — Thoughts on private collectors — Refusal to give advice to private collectors on objects' authenticity or value — On new world archaeology newsletter in *AJA*.

TAPE V, SIDE TWO 198

Publication support for *AJA* from the Getty Trust — On the use of color plates — Difficulties with getting good illustrations — The AIA monograph series — Abstracts from AIA meetings — On the difficulties of maintaining a positive, constructive criticism in *AJA* articles and reviews — Relationships with students outside of Bryn Mawr — Ridgway's first Ph.D. student, Nancy Bookidis — Mellink's criticisms of Bookidis's dissertation — Incorporating some of Bookidis's ideas in *The Archaic Style in Greek Sculpture* — Ridgway always cites her students' work in her own essays and books — Nancy Winter's master's thesis on the Benghazi Venus — Stella Miller now an expert on Macedonian archaeology — Ridgway's hope that the sculpture tradition could have continued at Bryn Mawr — More on Alice Donohue — James Wright — On Bryn Mawr's tendency to hire its former students — More on Mark Fullerton and his dissertation — Kim Hartswick's success at Bryn Mawr — Susan Kane — Disagreements with Kane over her manner of criticism in a book review — Michael Hornum, a former student who went into contract archaeology — Angeliki Kosmopoulou and Anne Marie Knoblauch — Mary Sturgeon and Harriet Anne Weis — George Szeliga's contributions — Carlos Picón as an undergraduate — His senior honors thesis was as good as most dissertations — Ridgway advised him to study in England — Worried that he was getting too involved in antiquarian issues — His switch from the academic to museum world — Charles Edwards, a brilliant career cut short by AIDS — Ridgway's joint article with Elizabeth Wakeley — The expansion of the archaeology program at Bryn Mawr — Recruitment of Gloria Pinney — Comparison of Mellink's, Pinney's, and Ridgway's styles as department chairs.

TAPE VI, SIDE ONE 223

Remembering Richmond Lattimore and Mabel Lang in the Greek department and Robert Broughton in Latin — Developing joint dissertations — On cracking the whip to get students to finish — The Bryn Mawr network — The "Ridgway Rangers" share a mode of thought, but are not a clique seeking power — Relations with Bryn Mawr alumnae groups — Phyllis Bober's contributions in art history and archaeology — Relationships with art historians — Charles

Mitchell and Steven Levine — Ridgway has never considered herself an art historian — No great interest in political, social, or religious histories of the ancient world — On what archaeologists have to teach historians by relying solely on the objects they find — Her review of Philip Fehl's book *The Classical Monument* — Prefers the work of Folkert van Straten over that of Walter Burkert — Revelation that the Pergamon altar may not be an altar at all — Andrew Stewart's views on the subject — More on contributions of the younger generation in the field of classical sculpture — International colleagues in the field: Olga Palagia, Erika Simon, John Boardman, and many others — Archaeology at the National Endowment for the Humanities — Working on the Fulbright panel — Archaeology as its own department versus being located in classics, art history, anthropology, or some other department — Problems with concepts of world archaeology — Work on the *Lexicon Iconographicum* — Ridgway's own plans and her thoughts on future areas of research for archaeologists.

Index 244

Richard Cándida Smith, Associate Professor of History and Director of the Program in American Culture at the University of Michigan, and Dr. Claire L. Lyons, Curator in Collection Development and Curatorial Projects at the Getty Research Institute for the History of Art and the Humanities, interviewed Brunilde S. Ridgway at the Department of Classics, Florida State University, Tallahassee, where she was the visiting Langford Eminent Scholar. A total of 7.75 hours were recorded. The transcript was edited by Katherine P. Smith.

Note: In her review of the transcript, Professor Ridgway added words and phrases throughout to provide additional information or clarification; these are all included within parentheses to distinguish them from the editor's insertions, which are bracketed.

CURRICULUM VITAE

Brunilde S. Ridgway

Present Title: Rhys Carpenter Professor Emerita of Classical and Near Eastern Archaeology at Bryn Mawr College

Date and Place of Birth: November 14, 1929, Chieti, Italy. Naturalized U.S. Citizen, 1963. Married, four sons.

Education:

Laurea in Lettere Classiche (Doctorate), Messina University, June 1953
M.A. in Archaeology, Bryn Mawr College, June 1954
American School of Classical Studies at Athens, 1955–57
Ph.D. in Archaeology, Bryn Mawr College, June, 1958
Doctor of Humane Letters, Honoris Causa, Georgetown University, May 1992
Doctor of Letters, Honoris Causa, Union College, June, 1992

Bryn Mawr College Appointments:

Assistant, 1957–58
Instructor, 1958–60
Assistant Prof., 1961–67
Assoc. Prof., 1967–70
Professor, 1970–77
Rhy Carpenter Professor of Classical and Near Eastern Archaeology, 1977–1993
Department Head, 1983–88
Acting Head, 1989–1991
R. Carpenter Professor Emerita, Jan., 1994–present

Other Professional Appointments:

Asst. Prof. and Chair, Dept. of Classics, Hollins College, Roanoke Va., 1960–61
Member, Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton, Jan–April, 1968
Andrew Mellon Distinguished Visiting Prof. in Fine Arts, Univ. of Pittsburgh,
    Pittsburgh, PA., Jan–April, 1978
Distinguished Visiting Prof. of Art History, The George Washington University,
    Wash., D.C., Sept–Dec., 1986
Elizabeth Whitehead Visiting Prof., American School of Classical Studies, Athens,

Greece, Sept.–Dec., 1988
Geddes-Harrower Chair in Archaeology at the University of Aberdeen, Scotland (six public lectures), Oct.–Dec., 1989
Cecil H. and Ida Green Visiting Professorship, University of British Columbia (Dept. Classics), Vancouver, B.C. (four public lectures and a seminar), March, 1990
Dr. Harry Lyman Hooker Distinguished Visiting Prof., McMaster Univ., Hamilton, Ontario, Canada, Jan., 1992
Visiting Prof., Australian lecture tour, Archaeological Institute of Australia at Athens, March, April, 1992
Hanes-Willis Visiting Prof., Dept. Art, Univ. of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (four public lectures and a seminar), March, 1995
Visitng Prof., Institute of Classical Archaeology, Aarhus University, Aarhus, Denmark (six public lectures), Oct, Nov., 1995

Professional Activities (partial listing):

Director, Summer Session, American School of Classical Studies, Athens, Greece, 1967 and 1971
Director, Study Tours of Sicily and of North Africa (Morocco and Tunisia) for the Archaeological Institute of America, 1971 and 1974
Editor-in-Chief, *American Journal of Archaeology* for the Archaeological Institute of America (ex-officio member of the Exec. Committee and the Publication Committee), 1977–1985
Leader, Archaeological Tours of Sicily, for the Alumnae/i Associations of Bryn Mawr/ Haverford Colleges, 1979 and 1994
Lecturer, the Thomas Spencer Jerome Lectures, University of Michigan and the American Academy in Rome, 1981–1982
Twelfth Félix Neubergh Lecturer, Gothenburg University, Sweden, Oct., 1988

Outside Grants and Awards (partial listing):

Gugenheim Fellowship, 1974–75
Kress Senior Fellowship, Center for Advanced Study in the Visual Arts (CASVA) at the National Gallery of Art, Washington D.C., 1986
Gold Medal of the Archaeological Institute of America for Distinguished Archaeological Achievement, 1988

Memberships:

Archaeological Institute of America, Life Member 1968–

German Archaeological Institute, Corresponding member, 1967–
International Association for Classical Archaeology, 1972–1991
Alumni Assoc., American School of Classical Studies at Athens, 1956–
ASMOSIA, 1988–94
American Philosophical Society, elected member, 1993–
Society for the Promotion of Hellenic Studies (London), elected Honorary Foreign Member in 1997.

Books:

The Severe Style in Greek Sculpture (Princeton 1970).
Classical Sculpture, Catalogue of the Classical Collection, Museum of Art, Rhode Island School of Design (Providence, RI 1972).
The Archaic Style in Greek Sculpture (Princeton 1977; 2nd rev. and expanded ed. Ares Publishers, Inc., Chicago 1993).
Aspects of Ancient Greece, Catalogue of a Loan Exhibition at the Allentown Museum of Art. B. S. Ridgway and G. F. Pinney, eds. (Allentown, PA 1979).
Fifth Century Styles in Greek Sculpture (Princeton 1981).
Roman Copies of Greek Sculpture: The Problem of the Originals (Ann Arbor 1984).
Ancient Anatolia. Essays in Honor of Machteld J. Mellink. B. S. Ridgway, J. V. Canby, E. Porada, and T. Stech., eds. (Madison 1986).
The Porticello Shipwreck: A Mediterranean Merchant Vessel of 415–385 B.C. Written with C. J. Eiseman (Texas A & M University Press 1987).
Hellenistic Sculpture I: The Styles of ca. 331–200 B.C. (Madison 1990).
Greek Sculpture in the Art Museum, Princeton University: Greek Originals, Roman Copies and Variants. B. S. Ridgway as general ed. and contributor of seven entries. (Princeton 1994).
Fourth Century Styles in Greek Sculpture (Madison 1997).

Articles (partial listing):

"The West Frieze of the Siphnian Treasury." *BCH* 86 (1962): 24–35.
"The Date of the So-Called Lysippean Jason." *AJA* 68 (1964): 113–128.
"Stone and Metal In Greek Sculpture." *Archaeology* 19 (1966): 3–42.
"Notes on the Development of the Greek Frieze," *Hesperia* 35.2, In Honor of W. B. Dinsmoor (1966) 188–204.
"The Bronze Apollo From Piombino in the Louvre." *Antike Plastik* 7 (ed. W.-H. Schuchhardt 1967): 43–75, pls. 24–34.
"Stone Carving." Chapter 4 in C. Roebuck, ed., *The Muses at Work: Arts, Crafts and Professions in Ancient Greece and Rome* (The M.I.T. Press, Cambridge,

MA 1969): 96–117.

"The Head of Ptolemy VI in Providence." *BullRISD, Museum Notes* 56.2 (Winter 1969): 6–19.

"Tha Setting of Greek Sculpture." *Hesperia* 40 (1971): 336–356.

"The Man-and-Dog Stelai." *JdI* 86 (1971): 60–79.

"A Story of Five Amazons." *AJA* 78 (1974): 1–17.

"The Peplos Kore, Akropolis 679." *Essays in Honor of Dorothy Kent Hill, Journal of the Walters Art Gallery* 36 (1977): 49–61.

"Greek Antecedents of Garden Sculpture." *Ancient Roman Gardens* (Dumbarton Oaks Colloquium on the History of Landscape Architecture VII), E. B. Macdougall and W. F. Jashemski, eds. (Washington D.C. 1981): 7–28.

"Sculpture from Corinth." *Hesperia* 50 (1981): 423–448.

"Of Kouroi and Korai, Attic Variety." *Hesperia* Supplement 20 (1982): 118–127, In Honor of Homer A. Thompson.

"Court Art and Hellenistic Art: The Role of Alexander the Great." *Archaeological News* 11.3/4 (1982): 43–58. Volume on Alexander the Great and His Legacy, Symposium at Rockford College and Northern Illinois University in 1981.

"The Gauls in Sculpture." *Archaeological News* 11.3/4 (1982): 85–104. Volume on Alexander the Great and His Legacy, Symposium at Rockford College and Northern Illinois University in 1981.

"The Fashion of the Elgin Kore." *JPGettyMusJournal* 12 (1984): 313–326.

"The Riace Bronzes: A Minority Viewpoint." Vol. 2 of *Due Bronzi da Riace* (*Bolld'Arte* Serie Speciale 3, Rome 1984): 313–326.

"Late Archaic Sculpture." In *Greek Art: Archaic into Classical*, C. G. Boulter, ed. (Leiden 1985): 3–17.

"The State of Research on Ancient Art." *The Art Bulletin* 68 (1986): 7–23.

"The 'Nike of Archermos' and Her Attire." *Chios. A Conference at the Homereion in Chios 1984.* J. Boardman and C. E. Vaphopoulou-Richardson, eds. (Oxford 1986): 259–274.

"Ancient Greek Women and Art: The Material Evidence." *AJA* 91 (1987): 399–409.

"Sculptor and Painter in Archaic Athens." In *Papers on the Amasis Painter and His World* (Colloquium sponsored by the Getty Center for the History of Art and the Humanities and Symposium sponsored by the J. Paul Getty Museum, Malibu 1987): 81–91.

"Sculpture and Society." In *The World of Early Greek Art* (The Art Institute of Chicago 1989): 19–35.

"Laokoon and the Foundation of Rome." *JRA* 2 (1989): 171–181.

"Defining the Issue: The Greek Period." In *Retaining the Original* (Studies in the History of Art vol. 20, National Gallery, Washington, D.C. 1989): 13–26.

"Leto and the Children." In *Festschrift Akurgal* 2, *Anadolu* 22 (1981/83 publ.

1989):91–109.

"Birds, 'Meniskoi' and Head Attributes in Archaic Greece." *AJA* 94 (1990): 583–612.

"Parthenon and Parthenos." In N. Basgelen and M. Lugal, eds., *Festschrift für Jale Inan* (Istanbul 1989, publ. 1991): 295–305.

"Archaic Architectural Sculpture and Travel Myths." *Dialogues d'histoire ancienne* 17 (1991): 95–112. Also published in *Pricernomor'e VII-V do n. e. Pis'mennye istocniki i archeologija* (Tbilisi 1990): 411–428.

"Greek Sculpture as Archaeological Evidence." The Reverend Edward W. Bodnar, S. J. Inaugural Lecture, published as pamphlet (pp. 1–19) by Georgetown University, Washington D.C., 1991 (distributed April 1992).

"The Study of Classical Sculpture at the End of the 20th Century." Review article, *AJA* 98 (1994): 759–772.

"Paene ad exemplum: Polykleitos' Other Works." In W. G. Moon, ed., *Polykleitos, the Doryphoros, and Tradition* (Madison 1995): 177–199.

"Roman Bronze Statuary—Beyond Technology." In C.C. Mattusch, ed., *The Fire of Hephaistos* (exhibition catalog, Cambridge, MA 1996): 122–137.

"Is the Hope Head an Italian Goddess? A Case of Circumstantial Evidence." *Expedition, The Magazine of the University of Pennsylvania Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology* 38.3 (1996): 55–62.

"A Goddess in Philadelphia." In B. Magnusson et al., eds., *Ultra Terminum Vagari. Scritti in onore di Carl Nylander* (Rome 1997): 271–279.

"An Issue of Methodology: Anakreon, Perikles, Xanthippos." *AJA* 102 (1998): 717–738.

SESSION ONE: 26 MARCH, 1997

[Tape I, Side One]

SMITH: We always start off with where and when you were born.

RIDGWAY: I was born in Chieti, in Abruzzi, on November 14, 1929, but I really didn't belong there at all. My father [Giuseppe Sismondo] was a military man and it was the end of his appointment in that particular place . . . I was going to say "site" and be very archaeological. He left [Chieti] shortly after I was born and we followed him thirty days later. So I cannot say that I'm really from Chieti. I was there thirty days and I've never been back.

SMITH: Was there a family home?

RIDGWAY: No. My father was from Piemonte and my mother [Maria Lombardo] was from Sicily. My father was in the Guardia di Finanza Corps, which means that every two years he was transferred, so we never put roots anywhere. We were in east Africa, in Ethiopia, for eight years, and even then we moved a lot. We started in Gondar, then we went to Asmara, then to Addis Ababa. We escaped from (occupied) Addis Ababa and went back to Asmara, and from there we went to Messina. The short answer usually is that I am from Messina, because that was the only place where we stayed any length of time; it was the end of my father's career. I went to the university in Messina, and from there I went to Bryn Mawr [College]. If you were to ask where I have spent the longest part of my life, I would have to say Bryn Mawr,

which of course is not my real home.

SMITH: Did your father have a university education?

RIDGWAY: He attended various Italian schools, and then the officers' academy. He ended up a brigadier general. He was the commander of the Guardia di Finanza of the Italian Empire when we were in Addis Ababa, so he was fairly high up.

SMITH: And you lived for eight years in Ethiopia then?

RIDGWAY: From 1938 to 1945.

SMITH: So you spent the war in east Africa?

RIDGWAY: Yes, although, I must say, when we went back to Italy in 1945 there was still the war with Japan on, and Italy was in terrible shape, especially Sicily, which had been the landing place of the Allies. Messina had been very heavily bombarded; it was built with antiseismic walls, and evidently the British didn't realize that it was just the shells of the houses that were standing—they wouldn't collapse—so they kept bombing and bombing and bombing. Ninety-five percent of the houses were destroyed. There was no glass on the windows, water was rationed, electricity was rationed. It was horrible.

SMITH: You mentioned while I was setting up that you lost some of your hearing during the war because of the bombing.

RIDGWAY: Yes, during the bombings in Africa. I didn't realize it for quite a long time because, first of all, in Italy everybody speaks much more loudly than they do in

the United States. Also, when I came to the United States and I was experiencing English politeness, I thought that I didn't understand the language. I didn't realize that it was really a question of not hearing. When I got married, every time my husband Pete [Henry W. Ridgway, Jr.] tried to say something to me after we had turned the lights off, I would turn the lights on. He couldn't understand why, in order to hear him, I had to turn the lights on. We finally realized that I was lip reading.

I had my hearing tested, and the doctor said something very funny. He asked me whether I was a lady riveter, because it was only a certain frequency that was missing in both ears. Below or above that frequency I was okay. At the time I didn't understand him at all, but then I was told afterwards that so many women during the war had taken up men's jobs. The only thing I could think of was the bombing, because we were fairly close to some of the bombs, and the doctor thought that that was a possible explanation. Now and then I use hearing aids. I used them last night at a lecture because it was a single source of voice, and in those situations it really helps. But the applause always kills me, or if I am in a room where there are several people speaking it's terrible. One to one I have no problem. I do stare at people, as you've noticed, because this way I lip read.

SMITH: Okay, I'll try to move my mouth.

RIDGWAY: That's okay, just be fairly loud, that's all. A man is always more understandable to me than a woman, because the high frequency is the problem, not

the low frequency.

SMITH: Could you tell us a little bit about your mother's family? You said she was from Sicily.

RIDGWAY: My grandmother on my mother's side was educated in Egypt. When she was twenty-five she was sent home with an arranged marriage and that was it; she had no choice. Her father and her uncle . . . one was the director of the Banco d'Italia, and the other one was the director of the postal services, but I couldn't tell you who was what. My grandmother went back and forth between Cairo and Alexandria, and she was brought up in that kind of international environment, so that even my mother was not the typical Sicilian—if there is such a thing as a typical Sicilian. In any case, my mother was from Messina. She married my father very young, but she had gone to the Istituto Magistrale, which in those days was the equivalent of the university, especially for women.

SMITH: How many brothers and sisters do you have?

RIDGWAY: I only had one sister, Mitì [Margherita Lombardi]. She died. And my mother was an only child.

SMITH: What kind of career did your sister have?

RIDGWAY: She married the family doctor when she was sixteen, and that was during the war, in Africa. She just finished high school; she didn't go to the university. She married in 1939 and the war started in 1940.

SMITH: Italy signed the peace with the Allies in '43?

RIDGWAY: In '43 Italy negotiated, let's say—

SMITH: Switched sides.

RIDGWAY: And that created a problem immediately in my family, because my brother-in-law was a medical officer. He also ended up a general. As a matter of fact, he ended up a lieutenant general. My father was a brigadier general, so my brother-in-law had one better on my father. Until then he had been allowed to stay with us, and when the invasion of Italy started, they sent him first to the Sudan, and then to Italy.

SMITH: The Italian government?

RIDGWAY: No, the British. The British took him prisoner, because he was an officer. They sent him to Italy though because he was a surgeon, and it was important to them to have surgeons (at the time of the invasion). In '43, after September 8, when there was the armistice with Italy, my father, who had been in Kenya for forty months as a prisoner of war, was sent to Italy. He was part of the so-called "forces of order," and his allegiance was to the King. All the military swore allegiance to the King first, and fascism was just the "government of the moment." So my father and brother-in-law were sent to Italy and made to work with the British and the Americans, and we women were stuck in Africa.

SMITH: Who was taking care of you in Africa? Was your mother working?

RIDGWAY: I worked! I was thirteen and a half when I got my first job, and my sister also worked. That's how I learned English, I learned it by practice. You see, we escaped from Addis Ababa, because otherwise we would have been deported into Sudan because of my father's position. All the authorities were automatically deported after a while. So we waited until my father came through, because he had been fighting at the Amba Alagi with the viceroy, and then he was taken prisoner; that was the last outpost of resistance. He was brought to Addis Ababa, and we waited there until they sent him to Kenya, and then we tried to go back to Asmara. Asmara was considered a prefascist colony, and therefore there were Italians there. As a matter of fact, the Guardia di Finanza was working together with the British forces in general, because the Guardia di Finanza, in addition to being a military corps, was also a force of order; they also worked very hard in peace.

Of course the British made it very hard for us to get back to Asmara. Eventually we escaped, and that was a rather dangerous thing to do. We left with the clothes we had on, and we went in a truck for eight days across from Addis Ababa to Asmara. There were lots of rebel pockets all over that were attacking convoys and killing people. We didn't have a convoy, we had one truck, and our German shepherd dog, who was very helpful. At that time my brother-in-law was with us. He was recovering from a terrible disease. He had been treating people coming from the front. They had a tropical disease that is the kind of typhus that you get from lice

(*tifo petecchiale*). I don't know what it's called in English. My brother-in-law almost died. My sister, who was very young, stayed close to him in a hospital during the Ramadan period (a Muslim religious period, roughly equivalent to Lent; at the time we were there, it was a time of religious fanaticism, when foreigners were being attacked and people were barricading themselves in their houses). There was no medicine, nothing. The hospital was a school gym with no glass in the windows. My mother was going back and forth from our house to the hospital taking oranges, because the vitamins were the only things that were keeping my brother-in-law alive. He was unconscious and delirious, and he was enormously weak when he came out of that illness, but he could escape with us. So we went back to Asmara.

As a medical officer, of course my brother-in-law was getting a salary, but when they took him prisoner, then both I and my sister had to get a job; otherwise there was no way to survive. I didn't say that I was thirteen and a half, I said I was sixteen, because I looked old enough, and everybody thought I was even older than that. There were no documents, there was nothing.

SMITH: What kind of job did you get?

RIDGWAY: It was at the telephone exchange of the police headquarters. This was the civil police, not the military police. I could learn the numbers up to ten, and all the rest I tried to pick up. I already had French, so English was my third language. Whenever I didn't understand something I'd just plug the person in with somebody

else until they straightened it out. I picked up a lot, as a matter of fact. I already knew how to type. From the time I was eight I was typing all my schoolwork on the portable Olivetti. I asked to be moved to a secretarial office so that I could learn how to write English. I was aware, of course, that it looked differently from the way it sounded. After a short time I moved to the customs office because they were working with the Guardia di Finanza, so I felt that I was more within my father's orbit.

SMITH: So this was the British occupation government?

RIDGWAY: Yes, this was the British occupation of Asmara. I worked in the Customs and Excise Department as a clerk typist until we went back to Italy, in 1945. I couldn't have gone to school. All the professors had been taken, the schools were not functioning, it really was a disaster. [Ethiopia] was an occupied country with everybody either killed or a prisoner.

SMITH: What did your father or your mother say about Mussolini and the fascist government?

RIDGWAY: Not very much. My father was a military man, and my brother-in-law was a doctor first and a military man afterwards. You lived by the law of the country. And, as I said, when the war started I was eleven, so whatever politics there might have been around me, I wouldn't have been aware of it at all. I remember being very mad at the British when there were the sanctions, in 1935, because my mother had to

give up her gold wedding ring; you know, everybody was giving their gold for the country. As a matter of fact, that was the time when I was learning French at the Berlitz. I was five. For some peculiar reason my family decided I was too young to go to an Italian school. This is the trouble with not having asked the questions then, (when my parents were alive), because I wonder why they sent me to the French school instead of the regular, Italian grammar school, or kindergarten. Then they wanted me to pick up another language, and I wanted to learn German rather than English because I was so mad at the English for the sanctions. But, of course, right after that we went to Africa, so unfortunately I didn't learn German, which would have been so helpful in archaeology! I had to learn it on my own afterwards.

SMITH: So when you went back to Messina, in '45, you hadn't been in Italy since you were a little child?

RIDGWAY: In a way, yes. We once went on a brief vacation with my father and mother, but that was all. In Messina there was still my grandmother on my mother's side. My father had a lot of family up in Piemonte, but they were all cousins, so in a way there was really no family in Italy; my immediate family was always with me.

SMITH: Was your father still in the military when you went back to Messina?

RIDGWAY: Oh yes. He was the commander of the twelfth legion for half of Sicily and part of Calabria.

SMITH: So what were the conditions like then, when you returned to Sicily?

RIDGWAY: As I said, pretty bad. Fortunately there was food, but windows were boarded up and houses were destroyed. The trip back was horrible. We were so shocked by the conditions in Naples. They put us on a cattle car to send us to Sicily, where they distributed everybody. That is one of the horror stories, but that has nothing to do really with my formation. I promised my children that I am going to write about my life so that they can see a little bit what I went through, because otherwise children never know parents. But those times were pretty rough. However, there were schools functioning, and life returned to normal, little by little. Eventually I decided to go back to school.

SMITH: You had missed four or five years of school?

RIDGWAY: Well, I had finished, theoretically . . . the school system is so completely different. Let's see. I had done what we would call the first year of the middle school (*scuola media*), which is not the gymnasium, but that was interrupted by the war. Then I tried to do the second year, and that also was interrupted by the war and after that I didn't do anything. So when I went to Italy I had the equivalent of a grammar school license. But in the meantime I felt I was a woman of the world. I had been supporting the family. I had been working. You know, the war makes you ripen up fairly fast. I couldn't have gone back to the level of an eleven-year-old, so I tried to do things privately. I hired a tutor for math, which I have never liked, and one for Greek, and I did the rest by myself. I did five years of schooling in five months. I

passed with flying colors, I want you to know. Then I went to high school, which is the *liceo classico* in Italy; it's more or less the equivalent of the B.A. I did three wonderful years of high school; those were very good years.

SMITH: You said you got a tutor in Greek. Why did you decide Greek?

RIDGWAY: Oh, because I had already had Latin, and I knew that I wanted to do classics. That I have always wanted to do. When I went to the university I wanted to go into philosophy. My mother wanted me to go into economics. I decided absolutely not, so we compromised between philosophy and economics and ended up with classics. You go to university only once in Italy, and you get a doctorate at the end of that, a *laurea*.

LYONS: Did living in north Africa, even at an early age, inspire some interest in archaeological monuments?

RIDGWAY: Well, I wasn't in north Africa, I was in east Africa. I have traveled through north Africa several times on my own since becoming an archaeologist, but no, east Africa doesn't have anything classical. Of course I was interested in Coptic things, but don't forget that when the war started I was ten or eleven, and you couldn't move around, you couldn't do anything; there was fighting everywhere. Italy declared war on June 10. On June 11 we had the first bombings. Then the invasion started immediately; it came up from South Africa and it moved very rapidly. We moved from Asmara to Addis Ababa because my father was promoted, and in Addis

Ababa it was really pretty terrible almost immediately. There were all the rebels that were brought back to Addis Ababa from the bush, where they had been since the time of [Marshal Rodolfo] Graziani, since the time of the 1935 war. So not much movement was possible at all.

Before we went to Asmara, as I said, we were in Gondar, and at that time there were rebel pockets all around. I was telling my husband the other day that I had to learn to shoot, even though I was only eight years old. I was told how to use a rifle, and there was a big discussion whether you hold it on the left shoulder or the right shoulder, and so on. Obviously, it must have been a very light rifle. We would shoot at *fiaschi*—wine bottles covered with straw. You know what I mean, the ones that they put in Italian restaurants when they want to make it look like the real thing, and they stick a candle in there. In any case, we would line all those *fiaschi* up and we would try to shoot them, my sister and I, because we were told that we had to defend ourselves. We weren't in the city, we were in the encampment with the Guardia di Finanza.

SMITH: At this time, when you started to study classics, was it the literature that attracted you, or was it already the art and the archaeology?

RIDGWAY: I think in Italy you always have classics around you. Even when you go to grade school what you learn is straight out of Livy; at least that was the case in my days. All the stories are told as part of Roman history, and Roman history is part of

Italian history. You are told about the foundation of Rome and all these kinds of things when you are six or seven. My mother had always bought me books on mythology; I was always interested in that. Classical culture is all around you in Italy, you can't escape it. I was always interested. I loved Latin, and I loved Greek even more.

SMITH: In Sicily, did you start going out to the monuments that are near Messina?

RIDGWAY: Some. I primarily concentrated on going to the university. As a matter of fact, I was in *lettere classiche*, which is different from being in archaeology. You take twenty-two exams on different subjects: ancient Roman history, ancient Greek history, philosophy, linguistics, Italian literature, all these kinds of things. You have some optional subjects, and usually people try to get an easy subject so that they can balance their average. I took all the compulsories of the modern languages because I wanted to have my English recognized. I actually ended up by taking a dissertation in English literature; it was on the English masques, I want you to know. It's bound, it's a book—my first publication. There is even a volume on Shakespeare that cites me; I was so impressed when somebody sent it to me. I went to the Shakespeare summer school in England one year because I was researching the masque, only to be told that the best documents were in Italy, of course.

So that was one of the things I did, and that's how I came to travel to the United States. My mother died at fifty-one, six months before I received my degree.

I was very upset by that because the last thing she said to me was, "I won't see you get your degree." I was very upset, I just wanted to get away. I was very close to my mother. I was at the university taking out all these books in English, so the librarian said to me, "There is a fellowship for an Italian in the United States." If anything I was thinking more of England, because I had enjoyed the Shakespeare summer school so much. I enjoyed the British in England. I had hated them in Africa; it was really terrible what they did to us. In England, they were models of civic behavior and I was very impressed with that. But because my mother had died, and this woman said there was this fellowship in the U.S., I applied for it. I was sure that since there was only one fellowship for the whole of Italy I wasn't going to get it, and I'm sure that everybody else thought the same thing. But I got it, and it was a great surprise.

The fellowship was from Bryn Mawr College, and when I was at the Shakespeare summer school there was a woman from Bryn Mawr. I wrote to her and she said, "Oh, you must come, this is a wonderful place." So I went to the information office in Palermo to tell them that I needed a visa to go to Bryn Mawr, and they said, "Oh, you must have a Fulbright." They immediately moved heaven and earth and they broke all the rules to get me in for a Fulbright. They even sent me a movie about Bryn Mawr. So somebody at the U.S. Information Service knew a lot about Bryn Mawr. It all sort of fell together, you know. My family was kind of

bewildered that there I was, going to the United States.

SMITH: What did your father think of this?

RIDGWAY: Well, my father was a very open-minded man. My parents had sent me to the Shakespeare summer school the year before. My family has always moved around. This is why I wanted to tell you about my mother and grandmother. We were never the people who say, "Oh, stay home and do this or that." The tradition has continued: my niece went for the diplomatic service, then got married, and now her daughter is going for the diplomatic service; she is in Brussels right now, and my niece's son is a journalist, and so is her husband. The family has always been world-oriented, it can't be helped, I guess. Surely my father minded a little bit, but otherwise it was okay.

I thought I was going to the United States for only a year, but then one thing led to another. Bryn Mawr sent me to Greece, and then I thought I could do my dissertation in absentia, but Bryn Mawr was in a state of flux. Rhys Carpenter had retired, and Machteld Mellink was on sabbatical. Cornelius Vermeule had accepted the position at the Boston Museum of Fine Arts, so he was leaving, and Alexander Cambitoglou hadn't even arrived yet. So Machteld Mellink said to me, "Come back and be a teaching assistant for one year. Then we can read your dissertation in peace." My father got fed up that time and said, "No. Come back home. You don't need an American Ph.D; it's not recognized in Italy anyhow." Rhys Carpenter at that

time was in Greece, and when I told him what my father said, he said to me, "It's your duty to come back, because we have supported you for these years and you owe it to us." He pushed the one button that my father would understand. So I wrote home, "Dear Father, it is my duty," and my father said all right. [laughter] Little did he know that I was then going to get married.

SMITH: Could you talk a little bit about your favorite teachers at Messina?

RIDGWAY: The Italian university is not at all like an American university. You go to classes and the professor doesn't show up. This was especially true in those days, when everybody tried to stay in Rome, where they had the one serviceable library where they could do research. In Messina, the library was bombed out and the facilities were terrible, so there were practically no classes. There were the so-called *dispense*, which were things that were written on the typewriter by professors and assistants and sort of put together with scotch tape; they were supposed to be a condensation of all the books that the professor could consult in Rome. You couldn't consult them anywhere else. So I don't know that there was a favorite teacher.

There were some pretty big names. There was Milio, for instance, in Greek literature, but I don't think he knew any one of the students. I studied archaeology with Giulio Jacopi, who as a person was despicable, but as a professor I must say he was interested in what he was doing. He was very generous with sharing his knowledge, and that gave me a great interest in archaeology, I must say. I don't

remember the name of the professor in linguistics, but I loved that subject. He was the kind of professor who really responded to us. Almost everybody thought linguistics was very boring. There were only four of us who liked it, and at the end of every class the professor would give us cookies, and in Italy that is unheard of. You know, in Italy you can prepare yourself on your own, show up at the exam, take the exam, and that's it. That's all that is necessary. There was the great Santi Mazzarino, who stayed in Rome, and in the four years that I was at the university he gave two classes. So I cannot say that there were any favorite professors.

SMITH: Why was Jacopi despicable as a person?

RIDGWAY: Okay. First of all, because he was a Nazi. He wasn't even a fascist, he was a Nazi. Maybe I shouldn't say this, because I have absolutely no idea whether it was true or not, but one of the things that I learned was that he had caused the death of an Italian archaeologist who was Jewish, because he denounced him to the Germans and the Germans took him and killed him. When he was asked why he did this, he said, "Oh, I didn't do it because he was Jewish, I did it because he was a rival." Now Mario Segre's last publication has come out (posthumously); it was reviewed in *Archaeology* a few years ago.

I didn't know all this at the time. All I could see then was that Jacopi was very interested in the students, and he was trying to share his knowledge. Of course, he had all these German publications in his own mind; he knew German. He was

Yugoslav, from that part of Italy that keeps shifting nationality at the border. His original name was Jacopic. He dropped the final "c" and made it Jacopi, I suppose, when that area went over to Italy. He was at the Reggio museum, and he showed us things there. He really paid attention to the students. Compared to the others, this was so very different. But then of course when you hear all these things about what he had done as a man, that really turns you off.

SMITH: What was the political life like at the University of Messina?

RIDGWAY: Of course, I lived at home, and most of the students lived at home. You usually go to the university that is closest to where you live. So I never really participated in the life of the campus, and there wasn't that much that I am aware of. On the other hand, I am not typical, because to this day I tend to live B.C., before Christ. Here in the United States I got very involved in the civil rights movement because I married a Quaker who was very involved. He got me involved in all these things, and of course I really shared in his ideals.

It occurred to me afterwards that I never listened to the news, I never read a newspaper, because I didn't have time. We started having children almost immediately. We had four children in less than five years. Bryn Mawr was no joke, either. The teaching load was killing. Now that the children are grown up, I listen to the news with my husband, I am going back in time, and I am filling in all the gaps. I used to have to ask my husband, "Is the president Republican or Democratic?" Now

I know it on my own. I never had time. There is a limit to what you can do.

SMITH: In postwar Italy there was all this new literature that was coming out because of the democracy.

RIDGWAY: Not at that time. Don't forget that I finished in 1953. I am aware of more from my high school, because my two philosophy professors there were both communists, and they were magnificent. I tell you, my high school was better than my university. If I had to take again either my prelims or my high school exams, I would take prelims any time, because the high school exams were really tough. You had outside examiners and you had thirteen subjects to cover for a period of three years. At the exams, you were responsible for the whole three-year program. Those were the days. High school now I think has been completely watered down in Italy.

I loved philosophy. One professor was called DeFilippo and the other one was called Giacomo Macrì. I can't remember the university professors, but philosophy in high school was so exciting. They were both communists the way the Italians are communist, in the sense of the ideology, the pure ideas; it wasn't the Russian form of communism. But I wasn't aware of them as communists, I was aware of them as philosophers. I never participated in demonstrations. In Italy there were so many parties; it wasn't either/or, you know. The communists went to church, and so on; it wasn't the kind of ideological situation where you would have a real position.

SMITH: Was your family religious?

RIDGWAY: Not in the sense of being very observant, but they were religious in the sense of having a deep sense of doing what is right, and that kind of thing . . . yes, very much so. I would say probably my father was more religious than my mother, but they made sure that we children had all the proper sacraments.

SMITH: So you went to church on some sort of regular basis?

RIDGWAY: Yes, except when I went skiing on Sunday. I had to confess that, and the priest was very mad at me, not because I didn't go to mass on Sunday but because I wore pants while skiing. [laughter] After that incident, of course I thought that he was ridiculous. But, again, my family was on the liberal side.

SMITH: Did you go to movies? Did you like the neorealist films that were coming out in Italy in the late forties, early fifties?

RIDGWAY: They didn't interest me at all. We *lived* that life, it was not an outside subject!

SMITH: What about contemporary literature or music?

RIDGWAY: Well, literature, yes, but not in terms of modern times. I have always tended to live earlier, in the past.

SMITH: And your philosophy was then mostly Greek philosophy?

RIDGWAY: History of philosophy. We finished with Kant, so I didn't do anything past that. We didn't even do Marx.

SMITH: Or Hegel?

RIDGWAY: No, no, we finished with Kant. But of course I liked the Greek part best, that I really liked.

SMITH: Now, was the fellowship that you got to come to the United States specifically to come to Bryn Mawr College?

RIDGWAY: Yes, to Bryn Mawr. I don't know whether they still do it or not, they probably don't, but in those days they were trying to bring in the native speakers for the departments in which they were teaching the languages, and so they had a French, a Spanish, a German and an Italian department. The native person was brought in with the obligation of giving five hours a week to the respective department, and I was the fellow for Italian. But then that person could study whatever they wanted. I had specified either English or archaeology, because archaeology at Bryn Mawr was famous, and in my own studies I had seen what Rhys Carpenter was doing. But I also had taken my dissertation in English on the English masques, so English would have been also possible. The answer came back that I had been accepted by both departments, but that Rhys Carpenter would love to work with an Italian. So I said, "Ah, archaeology." Then of course once I started with Rhys Carpenter I was completely sold.

LYONS: I was curious, even though you didn't primarily study archaeology in Italy, did you meet or have contact with other major professors in Italian archaeology?

RIDGWAY: No, not at all.

LYONS: Who was active then?

RIDGWAY: Well, I know that the one book that we studied, because it had just come out, was a book by [Giovanni] Becatti: *Problemi Fidiaci*. That was the one book that was available. But I met Becatti here, when he came to talk at Bryn Mawr; I didn't even meet him in Italy. The only one I knew there was Jacopi, because, again, it was from 1949 to 1953. I got my degree in 1953 and I came to Bryn Mawr in September of '53. I finished high school in 1949.

LYONS: So you had no real contact with any of the archaeologists in the *soprintendenze*?

RIDGWAY: No, none. It was classical letters; it wasn't even archaeology, you see.

SMITH: Did you take any classes in art history?

RIDGWAY: Well, one of the exams I had to take was art history. I can still tell you the courses I had with Jacopi. In those days we had Greek epigraphy, and he was teaching that. One course was on Polykleitos and the other one was on Myron. There were the fascicles that were being put out by [Ranuccio] Bianchi Bandinelli at the time, so we were trying to do whatever could be done with whatever books there were.

SMITH: Well, how would Jacopi teach Polykleitos or Myron? What did he expect you to know?

RIDGWAY: No, not at all.

LYONS: Who was active then?

RIDGWAY: Well, I know that the one book that we studied, because it had just come out, was a book by [Giovanni] Becatti: *Problemi Fidiaci*. That was the one book that was available. But I met Becatti here, when he came to talk at Bryn Mawr; I didn't even meet him in Italy. The only one I knew there was Jacopi, because, again, it was from 1949 to 1953. I got my degree in 1953 and I came to Bryn Mawr in September of '53. I finished high school in 1949.

LYONS: So you had no real contact with any of the archaeologists in the *soprintendenze*?

RIDGWAY: No, none. It was classical letters; it wasn't even archaeology, you see.

SMITH: Did you take any classes in art history?

RIDGWAY: Well, one of the exams I had to take was art history. I can still tell you the courses I had with Jacopi. In those days we had Greek epigraphy, and he was teaching that. One course was on Polykleitos and the other one was on Myron. There were the fascicles that were being put out by [Ranuccio] Bianchi Bandinelli at the time, so we were trying to do whatever could be done with whatever books there were.

SMITH: Well, how would Jacopi teach Polykleitos or Myron? What did he expect you to know?

RIDGWAY: First of all, he expected us to know the entire background on Greek sculpture and Greek culture. I remember at that time we read Pericle Ducati's *L'arte classica*, which nobody ever uses anymore, but it was a sort of general handbook. We were studying all the literary sources, the statue bases, replicas, plastic anatomy, various things. We also studied Pheidias, in the Becatti book. So these were the two courses in archaeology. Sculpture was one of my interests, and when I came to the United States and started working with Carpenter, of course that was reinforced ten times. So Greek epigraphy, Greek history, and other classes were all part of the total background. Archaeology was just one aspect of it. But archaeology was primarily a study of the art of the time.

SMITH: In Italy, or in the United States as well?

RIDGWAY: In Italy.

SMITH: Can you recall your first encounters with Carpenter and what he was like?

RIDGWAY: Oh, he was quite a character. When I went to Bryn Mawr I was very Italian, and therefore I had expected to have very little contact with the professor, but at Bryn Mawr you have a lot of contact with the professor. So I was overwhelmed that he was paying so much attention to me. I think perhaps he paid more attention to me than he did to other students. This is something I heard from Miss Mellink, because she thought he hadn't been quite as interested in others. I think he was interested in me more because he was amused than because of anything else. I still

have all the cards that he would write me, because whenever I didn't know a word, I invented it, and I invented it mostly from Latin. Then he would write me, "Dear Miss Sismondo, This word existed in this dictionary of 1742," or whatever it was. I have all these little cards. He always found the obsolete word, because, obviously, having come from the Latin they were words that existed but had dropped out of the common language.

Carpenter told me what to write my M.A. on, and then he obviously expected to meet with me and have all sorts of discussions. Instead, since he had given me the topic, during the Christmas break I wrote it. I arrived at his doorstep at the beginning of the second semester and I said, "Dr. Carpenter, here it is." He said, "What is this?" He couldn't get over it. He had given me the kind of topic that I could do, because he had said, "Without reading all the literature, just using your eyes, see if you can put the kouroi and the korai into some kind of chronological sequence." At the time there was great excitement over the book by [Humfry] Payne, and over Tony [Antony E.] Raubitschek's book on the dedications from the Athenian Acropolis, so he was interested in that. He had been reviewing those books, and he wanted to see what I could do without being brainwashed. So that was something that I thought I could do on my own, and I had never expected the professor to be holding my hand. My supervisor in Italy never even read my dissertation. At my defense—you know, you have two people, one to defend you and the other one to attack you—of course the

person who was supposed to attack me had read it, but my own professor had not read it.

So I was surprised that Carpenter had wanted to take more of an interest in my work. I think that he liked it. He didn't tell me to change it at all. He asked me to stay for the Ph.D. and I said I'd better go home. He said, "No, no, no, we'll send you to Greece." So that was the carrot, obviously. As a matter of fact, I had had delusions of trying to go to the University of Utah or the University of Arizona just to see that part of the country, because all I had seen was Bryn Mawr. Carpenter said, "Ridiculous. You couldn't study any classical archaeology there. Be sensible. If you stay at Bryn Mawr, we'll send you to Greece." He really told me what to do.

Carpenter was a fascinating lecturer and a fantastic speaker. He was called the Bryn Mawr nightingale. I have snatches of his sentences from my class notes because I wanted to remember how he was phrasing certain things more than what he was saying about a particular monument. It was just fantastic. He made everything interesting. Once he came to class and he was talking about the Bologna Situla, with those funny men that have those Don Abbondio hats (a priestly hat, named after a character in Alessandro Manzoni's *I Promessi Sposi*), and he showed one slide for the whole hour. I'm pretty sure that he had arrived at the last minute, he didn't have time, he picked out one slide, put that in, and talked the whole hour. But it was so wonderful. It was only afterwards that you realized, "My word, he never changed the

slide!" The man was unbelievable. He knew so much. He was very knowledgeable in a variety of fields, not just in Greek sculpture or Greek art.

[Tape I, Side Two]

SMITH: What classes did you take with Carpenter? Were they seminars?

RIDGWAY: One was a tutorial. There were very few graduate students in those days. I had only two years of Rhys Carpenter. I listened to his undergraduate courses. I remember the seminar on Hellenistic sculpture, and what was the other one . . . did I have another one? No, that was it. The first year it was a tutorial and the second year it was Hellenistic sculpture. I don't think there was anything else.

SMITH: So most of the interaction was conversation.

RIDGWAY: Right. And listening to his lectures, because the undergraduate courses were lectures, of course, and seminar reports.

SMITH: You mentioned he gave you this M.A. thesis topic. Was it intended to be an M.A. thesis?

RIDGWAY: Yes, because I was there for only one year. I could not take a Ph.D. in one year, but I could take an M.A. It usually takes two years for an M.A., but since I was coming from the Italian *laurea*, and since I had had the languages and everything else, everybody thought that maybe I could take an M.A. and so I did. But I also had seminars with other people, not just with Rhys Carpenter. I had seminars with Miss [Mary Hamilton] Swindler and Miss Mellink. The load is three seminars per

semester.

LYONS: Could you tell us about Mary Hamilton Swindler?

RIDGWAY: Yes, but unfortunately what I will tell you is not really the best of Mary Hamilton Swindler, because she was very old when I had her. She had already retired twice, and Bryn Mawr was trying to have her teach a little bit longer, because otherwise she couldn't have received a pension. Her mind was no longer as sharp as it used to be. Sure, the woman knew an enormous amount, but she was in her late seventies if not already eighty, so she was really no longer the inspiring teacher that everybody says she was.

LYONS: This was vase painting and those kinds of topics?

RIDGWAY: Monumental painting and vase painting, yes, that's what she was teaching. As a matter of fact, I took one prelim in monumental painting, one in vase painting, one in Cretan archaeology, and one in Greek sculpture. Those were my prelims.

SMITH: Tell us about Mellink at that time.

RIDGWAY: Aren't you going to interview her?

SMITH: We probably will.

RIDGWAY: You should, you should.

LYONS: We like to have cross-references and different viewpoints, so it would be nice to hear what you have to say as well.

RIDGWAY: Well, she was quite young, and she was very Dutch. She still is very Dutch. By that I mean that although she was quite friendly, she also had a certain detachment; you never really got very close to Miss Mellink. I have been her student, then colleague, and friend since 1953, and I cannot tell you that I know her. Sure, I worship the woman, but always from a certain distance. As I said, it's not because she is unfriendly, it's just because she doesn't communicate, she doesn't share. She will help you out, she will discuss archaeology with you, she will expect the world from you, always pitching it so high that you kill yourself trying to meet her requirements, but I never was what you might call a friend with her. To some extent I think I was probably closer with Rhys Carpenter, whom I saw less, than I was with Miss Mellink, whom I saw every day.

SMITH: How did she organize her seminar? Do you recall the seminar you took with her?

RIDGWAY: When we started the first Cretan seminar, Ann [Harnwell] Ashmead and I were the only two in there. She said to us, "Read [J. D. S.] Pendlebury [*The Archaeology of Crete*], and then come back to me next Monday and tell me what subjects you think we should be investigating." I remember sitting outside the graduate center reading the whole of Pendlebury, and for a person who had never really been exposed to field archaeology, that was absolutely overwhelming. Then she would immediately pitch it to problems. She had a terrific mind.

SMITH: What kind of problems seemed to interest her most?

RIDGWAY: Cultural and historical problems. I wouldn't say anthropological, because that sounds like the New Archaeology, and that is not what it was, but she really had a much more global vision, let's say; she wanted to see interactions. Her interest was very strong in Anatolia. Even when she was doing Crete, she was interested in all the contacts with Egypt, with Anatolia, with all the other countries, so you ended up by doing a million other things besides Cretan archaeology.

SMITH: Was Valentin Müller still at Bryn Mawr when you were there?

RIDGWAY: No, he wasn't. He had died before.

SMITH: But Vermeule was still there.

RIDGWAY: Cornelius came during the two years that I was in Greece. Emily came back as a graduate student, but actually only to take prelims and then for the defense, and she was in the Greek department; I never had anything to do with her. She was also far more advanced than I was.

SMITH: Who were the other students who were at Bryn Mawr while you were a student?

RIDGWAY: There were actually two. One was Ann Ashmead, and the other one was Miriam Ervin, who eventually married Jack [John] Caskey, *the* Caskey. Well, one can't even say that, because his father [Lacey Davis Caskey] was also *the* Caskey, but this was the prehistorian Caskey, who was the director of the American School

[of Classical Studies at Athens] when I was there. Miriam and Anne Ashmead and I are still good friends; we were the only three. There were other people evidently who were getting their Ph.D.s, but we never saw them, and there weren't that many of them. The department was very small.

SMITH: Did you have friends in other departments then?

RIDGWAY: Not really. There was Denys [L.] Page, who came to give some lectures in the Greek department, and I went to sit in on those seminar sessions. I found out that the way he pronounced Greek was very different from the way Richmond Lattimore pronounced it, which was in turn very different from the way I pronounced it, coming from Italy. Finally I gave up because I couldn't understand Page's Greek, but I went to hear his public lectures, and they were tremendous.

I made a lot of friends through the graduate center, where I lived, but not through the department. For instance, in my first year I had a lot of friends among the Indians. I had never met Indians before. These were Asian Indians, and I went around with them a great deal and I enjoyed them tremendously; they opened up a completely different culture to me. The second year I had decided that I wanted to do square dancing. I didn't know what it was and it puzzled me very much. So I got in touch with somebody who called square dancing for a hobby, and I got to meet him and the rest of his family. Every Thursday he would come to pick up a group of foreign students from Bryn Mawr, pile us all up in his little Volkswagen and drive to

Penn [University of Pennsylvania], where we would do square dancing.

This man's nephew turned out to be my future husband. But it took quite a while for us to get to know each other, because we would meet at Penn and then we would square dance and leave. A French girl eventually married a French Canadian from that group, but I very happily went to Greece and kept writing to Pete's mother, not to him, because I was very good friends with her and his uncle. I never thought that Pete was interested in me. My husband is a man of very few words. Then when I came back from Greece, I found that the group had dispersed and had stopped going square dancing, but I still wanted to go because it was wonderful; I love square dancing. Pete was the only one of the group who was still around, so we went square dancing and he proposed almost immediately.

My family of course was quite furious. They made me go back to Italy and stay there three months during the summer to make sure that I knew what I was doing, that it wasn't because I was lonesome, or that I had forgotten what Italian men were like. They gave me a car, they gave me all sorts of things, trying to convince me to stay in Italy. They also thought that an American would be a heavy drinker and a heavy smoker, but of course my husband, being a Quaker, didn't drink and didn't smoke, so that was a good point. I knew what I was doing. By that time I was twenty-eight. My sister, who had married at sixteen, said I was rushing into marriage. However, she had married a man who was eighteen years older. I was marrying "my

son," as they said, because my husband is six months younger than I am.

So that was a great scandal in the family, but eventually they agreed. I couldn't marry in Italy because then I couldn't have come back. Having had a Fulbright, I had sworn that I wasn't going to marry an American, because at that time there was the great fear of a brain drain. So in my innocence I went to the immigration office before I went home for these three months probation and said to them, "What do I do if I come back and get married?" They said, "First of all, don't marry in Italy, come back and get married here. But don't tell us; tell us only after you've already gotten married. We can't kill you." So I did that. I came back on September 2, and we married on September 6. I went to the immigration office and told them that I got married, and they made me fill a form. One of the questions was, "Did you know when you came back to this country that you were going to get married?" I honestly said, "Yes, of course." The man said, "No, no, no." He crumpled up the form and said, "You have to tell me that you did not know. You must say that you had no idea, that he swept you off your feet." He was a very sympathetic kind of person.

SMITH: You were lucky.

RIDGWAY: Yes, I was lucky. And also, because [Pete] was the American citizen, they couldn't ask him to go abroad for two years, as they would have if the wife had been the citizen. That was the law at the time. So I had permanent-resident status for

quite a while. Then when we started having one boy after another I thought that maybe for the boys it would be better if I had citizenship too. I had lost mine, because in those days an Italian who married a foreigner automatically lost Italian citizenship. Now you don't anymore, and if I were to try I could get it back, but what's the point? But I feel badly, because I wasn't leaving Italy, I was marrying an American. I was not repudiating my country; I still felt quite attached to my country, but those were the laws in those days.

SMITH: Someone comes and takes your passport from you? How do they know that you've married an American?

RIDGWAY: For one thing, because I was here. They took my passport, yes.

SMITH: While you were a graduate student, what was your relationship to archaeology at Penn, or at Princeton?

RIDGWAY: Once I was at Bryn Mawr, even Miss Swindler had made a major point of taking students to the annual meetings and introducing them to people. To my eternal shame, I remember that she introduced me to Margarete Bieber, and it was quite clear that I didn't know who she was. Margarete Bieber said, "Don't be embarrassed. There is no reason why you should know who I am." Miss Swindler was having conniptions that I didn't know who Margarete Bieber was. In retrospect, of course, I would have conniptions myself, but her book (on Hellenistic sculpture) had not yet come out, and of course that was my very first time here. There were lots

of people coming to speak at Bryn Mawr, and the professors always made it a point to introduce the students. There was very active interaction with Penn. Penn people were taking courses at Bryn Mawr, and we were going to the Penn lectures. Miss Mellink was excavating with Rodney Young, who was at Penn. So there was a very close relationship. Not so much with the graduate students, even though they were around; that was happening more when I came back, and when the department began to be a little bit larger.

SMITH: What about relations with Princeton, or the Institute for Advanced Study?

RIDGWAY: At that time, not so much. When Kyle [Meredith] Phillips [Jr.] came to Bryn Mawr, the ties with the Institute and with Princeton became much stronger. He opened the way for us to go and listen to lectures at Princeton. Friendships existed already. Miss Mellink was already friendly with Princeton people, but the idea of driving to Princeton to hear a lecture wasn't so common. Eventually I spent one semester at the Institute. Of course, some of these people I had met at the American School in Athens, which was a wonderful place to meet everybody. So don't count my first two years, but when I came back from spending two years at the school in Athens, I knew practically the whole archaeological world. Not only did I know the Americans, but I also knew the Italians. The first year I was in Athens, Bryn Mawr supported me. In the second year they only gave me $500. I couldn't have written my dissertation during the first year, because all the archaic material was in crates.

Greece had had ten more years of war than the rest of Europe, and they had just come out of it.

By a complete coincidence, in my second year, one of the professors at the Italian Institute of Culture had to go back to Italy in a hurry because her father had died and her mother was alone. They needed somebody with an Italian *laurea* to teach Italian to the Greeks. So they approached me, and I said, "But I don't know enough Greek." They said, "That's the whole point. You have to teach them Italian." So I did that, and I made wonderful friends there, friends that are among the best that I have had in my life. I still keep in touch with those who are still alive. That was a wonderful opportunity; not only did I move in American circles, but I got to know people from the French School and people from the German School, and both the Italian School of Archaeology and the Italian Institute of Culture. And lots of Greeks. So that was fun, too. I really loved my two years in Greece.

SMITH: Is that the longest time that you've spent there?

RIDGWAY: I have been back for a whole semester, but I have never been there again a whole year, no. That was the longest time.

I would like to say, and I will say this quite honestly, that maybe I was too Italian for the American archaeologists at the time; they didn't take me seriously. They just saw that I was having such a wonderful time in Greece, and they thought that I couldn't be serious. It took them quite a while to realize that I really was

serious. I was enjoying myself, but I was also studying a great deal. So there was a certain amount of snobbism. Also, I was doing sculpture and everybody else was doing prehistory. You know, there are certain things that the American School in Athens even now does not do. Vase painting and sculpture were considered "artsy." Of course I was in that category, so the American School did not embrace me warmly. But on the other hand, the people were terrific, and I had some of the best professors there.

In my first year, [W. B.] Dinsmoor, Sr. was the visiting professor, so I did tons of architecture with him. All my architecture today is still rooted in what I learned with Dinsmoor. During that summer (1956) he was the director of the summer school and he asked me to be his assistant, so I went through Greece with him; I didn't just have him for the Akropolis. The seminar he was giving for the school was on the Akropolis of Athens, and we also had [Gorham Phillips] Stevens and we had [Bert Hodge] Hill—the three people who had worked most on the Akropolis monuments—right then and there. In those days you could walk all over the Parthenon, and you could go into the temples. There were no boardwalks made of wood; you could really see the rock cuts. It was fantastic to be in Greece in those days. Caskey was the director of the school and Eugene Vanderpool was the professor. Vanderpool was fantastic. So I really had the best possible period in Greece in terms of professors.

LYONS: Who were the other professors?

RIDGWAY: Well, [W.] Kendrick Pritchett was another visiting professor during my first year. He is still at Berkeley, still studying, researching, and writing. He was a great one for battles, and for the tactics of battles; that's what he writes about. He would come on the school trips with us. Then there was a professor called William E. Gwatkin, Jr., who came on the trips with us, but I got to know him very little; he was a philologist. And then let's see . . . the second year that I was at the school, [George M. A.] Hanfmann and Carpenter were the two professors. Hanfmann and Carpenter quarreled over certain pieces of sculpture, but this is understandable, because all people who work in sculpture disagree. So I really had the cream of the crop when it comes to being taught; it was great fun.

SMITH: How did your dissertation topic come about?

RIDGWAY: Well, Carpenter liked what I had done with archaic, that famous M.A., you know, so he said, "Why don't you do it for the Ph.D.?" I thought I was still doing it with him. Instead, he had retired, so he thought that he should keep his hands off. Even though I was giving him all these chapters when I was in Athens, he would read them and return them to me without any comment whatsoever, and I didn't know why. Finally, he said he had expected the people at Bryn Mawr to be doing that. Then Miss Mellink said, "Come back and do it here, with Cambitoglou."

Cambitoglou did not really know sculpture, he really knew vase painting, and he would quarrel with my English. I wasn't going to take that from him, because he was Greek and his English wasn't any better than mine. So Miss Mellink, who was Dutch, tried to settle our disagreements by offering a different rendering of the English version. Then I finally would go to the graduate center, where there was a girl from England, and I would say to her, "Who is correct, which is the right way?" And she would say, "None of you are correct. This is the way to say it." We just quarreled about points of phraseology and grammar; it was no longer a question of content, you realize that.

Miss Mellink found out at the end that Carpenter would very much have liked to have been present at my defense, and she felt terrible that she hadn't invited him. He still felt that he wanted to follow me, but he felt that it was incumbent upon him to keep his hands off. So, in a way, nobody was my supervisor, and this was another project that was written completely by me. That's it. But I was used to that in Italy. You develop independence. However, I will tell you this: in Italy, as long as you are a student, you are expected to repeat what the professor says. I had my first tutorial with Rhys Carpenter, and I'll never forget it. He was talking about the Moschophoros and Antenor's Kore. Those were the days when they were measuring things, and there were all those problems of symmetry and the golden rule. Carpenter didn't believe in it, and he was trying to work it out. So he told me, "So-and-so thinks this,

and so-and-so thinks that. What do you think?" I immediately said, "Oh, how can I think anything, sir? You tell me." He said, very surprised, "Why, can't you think?" And sure, it occurred to me that I could think! Nobody had ever asked me to think, if you know what I mean; in Italy that wasn't the way. But I loved to think, so from that point on I thought a lot.

In a way, that was a very liberating experience. I have since had students from Greece, from Turkey, from these other countries where they have been brought up exactly the way I was, and it takes a while to force them to think, to tell them, "Use your own mind. Don't necessarily believe what I say." As a matter of fact, I particularly ask my students to disagree with me, not to take my word for granted; on the contrary, I don't know that I am right. So I want the student to think with his or her own mind. This is something that the United States did for me; I would have never had that in Italy. Here they really made me think from the very beginning, and that was very helpful.

SMITH: Were you satisfied with your dissertation when you were finished with it?

RIDGWAY: I didn't do anything with it. I had a couple of ideas; I developed one into an article. But when I wrote my book on the archaic [*The Archaic Style in Greek Sculpture*] I hardly touched my dissertation; I wrote it in a completely different way.

SMITH: Because your thinking had progressed?

RIDGWAY: Because I had been teaching a lot by that time. Teaching makes a big difference.

SMITH: How had teaching changed the way you were thinking?

RIDGWAY: Well, for one thing, much as I had been able to think on my own, I was still very influenced by Carpenter; so much so that in my early books I automatically acknowledged him, because I could no longer tell what were my ideas and what were his ideas. Also, Carpenter had a way of teaching that was phenomenal. He would ask you questions—you know, the famous Socratic process—and you ended up by giving him the answer he wanted, but you weren't aware of it. You thought that it was a brilliant idea that you just had, and it had occurred to you by chance. Only afterwards did you realize that that was really the way he had been leading you all along. So I wasn't quite sure what was my thinking and what was his thinking. But after a while I started really disagreeing with some of the things he was saying—as I was teaching, and as I saw more. The one gift that he gave me was to use my eyes, really to look at something, really to let the object speak for itself, not to take for granted what other people had said. I think this was his way of teaching me, when he said, "Do this for the M.A. without reading what others have said. Just use your eyes."

SMITH: Now, does using your eyes also mean using a tape measure?

RIDGWAY: Not necessarily, no, but it involves developing an understanding of style

and an understanding of the monument. I think one of the things that I have done throughout my career has really been to get a sense of what is Greek and what is not Greek, what is typical of a certain period and what is not typical of a certain period. As a matter of fact, my very first book, on the severe style [*The Severe Style in Greek Sculpture*], was just that; there are some works that look severe in style, but they're not severe in period. I then continued along this vein throughout.

SMITH: What was your training in stylistic analysis, other than just talking about these things with people?

RIDGWAY: I am not aware of any specific training, other than having been exposed to Carpenter, to other professors, and having looked myself. I have looked at a lot of things. After a while, you can't even say why you see something, but you do see it. Also, it occurred to me in teaching that after a while you see much more than the untrained eye. So things that I would take for granted that the students would see, I could see that they hadn't, and I had to point them out. It's like the difference between a person who listens to a piece of music and can hear all the instruments and a person who is not familiar with music and just hears the general tune. The more you hear, the more you listen to a piece of music, the more you pick up the various instruments, and this is the same thing with sculpture.

But of course, I wasn't doing just sculpture; I was doing vase painting, monumental painting, and architecture. Architecture is my second love. I don't know

whether it is because of Dinsmoor or because it is three-dimensional, but I cannot do sculpture without doing architecture, and I cannot do architecture without doing sculpture. Vase painting doesn't really speak to me anywhere near the same way. Yes, it's iconographically helpful, but it does not inspire the same gut response that I get when I stand in front of a building or in front of a statue. I think that that is due primarily to my penchant for three-dimensional perception, which not everybody has; there are some people who really are much more two-dimensional. Carl Nylander always used to say that he never really saw in the third dimension, whereas for me that is the most important dimension. But I cannot say that I had any specific formal training. Whatever art history I had had in Italy was really literally the history of art, not stylistic training.

LYONS: Two years ago, Richard and I were interviewing Nikolaus Himmelmann, and he described the process by which he was taught to look at sculpture with [Ernst] Buschor. Did any of the German writings on sculpture have an influence on your scholarship?

RIDGWAY: No, not at all. As a matter of fact, I found Buschor almost incomprehensible. There was a review of one of Buschor's books that said one would learn more from looking at the order in which he had placed the photographs than from reading the text. So I felt vindicated, because I hadn't understood anything of what he had said. I found it very, very difficult.

SMITH: You had had linguistics in Italy; was there any influence of linguistic or semiotic theory beginning to filter into your work?

RIDGWAY: The way they're using linguistics now is completely different. What we were doing there with linguistics was really seeing how words were transformed. We started with Sanskrit, then we would go to Greek, to Latin, and then to French and to German. I then would add English because I knew it, just to see how the words were changing. But that's primarily what we were doing with linguistics, not the structuralism and semiotics that you have now. This is a new development.

SMITH: So at Bryn Mawr and at the American School, in the fifties, there wasn't that kind of thinking about how images go together?

RIDGWAY: No. If you read my books, I'm sure you will understand them, whereas if I read something about modern analysis of art, I don't understand a word. And, I admit it quite frankly, I don't want to be that way. I want to communicate. I don't want to be so convoluted that I can't figure out what I am saying. That to me is fuzzy thinking, when you are spending so much time on theory that basically you are losing track of the object itself. I am very empirical.

SMITH: While you were writing your dissertation, what were the debates that most interested you?

RIDGWAY: There were no debates, because I didn't have anybody else around me who was doing sculpture at the time, and at the American School obviously there was

nobody. In Bryn Mawr, Ann Ashmead was writing on vase painting. So I really was debating with myself. Of course, the issues in sculpture were chronology, reconstructions, whether the Athenian treasury was 510 or 490, whether it was before or after the battle of Marathon—these kinds of things. It wasn't even so much a question of the message of the sculpture (now, even I myself have moved more in that direction), it was a question of establishing the groundwork, because so much was up in the air. You had no chronology, you had no arrangement. It was understood already at that time that even the *Perserschut* was not necessarily a sealed deposit, and therefore you had no way of knowing where these objects were, chronologically. The famous reconstruction of the Hekatompedon: what do you do with this? where do you put it? These were all practical things, trying just to understand what we had. In a way, we don't know it even now.

SMITH: Well, I was going to ask you that. Have many of those questions been resolved today, in the last thirty years?

RIDGWAY: No. I think we are asking different questions, and I think these questions are much more interesting to some extent. We also realize what we don't know, which I think is a great advantage. I used to think we knew a great deal, and now I know that we do not know. So many things were taken for granted; that's what you learned and that was it. You might dispute points of detail, but basically you knew. I am convinced that we don't know anything. A great deal is really very

uncertain, and even things that I said I have to take back, now that I see better or know a little bit more.

SMITH: Can you give an example?

RIDGWAY: Okay. I wrote my M.A. and my Ph.D. dissertation on archaic sculpture, and I always took the *meniskoi* on the head of the statues for granted: the hair was just simplified; the sculptor had just rendered a different texture because he didn't want to bother with realism, and all that kind of thing. Well, when I really started working on *meniskoi,* I found out that some statues actually had caps, which I thought were simplified versions of hair. Then I realized that one famous statue had a helmet. Not everybody believes me, but I am convinced that it is a helmet, and therefore that statue is a representation of Athena. Here was archaic material that I had worked with all my life, and I started seeing things that I hadn't seen; this was eight years ago.

SMITH: There's an article that appeared in *AJA* [*American Journal of Archaeology*] in 1990 ["Birds, 'Meniskoi,' and Head Attributes in Archaic Greece."].

RIDGWAY: Yes. In 1988, I was at the American School in Athens looking at all the *meniskoi*. I know it was '88 because my sister died that year.

SMITH: You mentioned that you took classes in Cretan and to some degree Anatolian archaeology. What about Roman archaeology, or Balkan or Egyptian?

RIDGWAY: Well, this was the beauty of being at Bryn Mawr. Being the T.A., I had

to do the conferences for the introductory course, which included Egypt and Mesopotamia. I knew nothing about Egypt and Mesopotamia, so I certainly had to do a lot of scrambling on my own. But that opened my eyes, because it's so wonderful to see one culture in comparison to another. It was very helpful to be at Bryn Mawr where there was the Near Eastern component. Then Kyle Phillips introduced Etruscan archaeology, and to this day that has also been very helpful. (Here in Florida, we just had a conference on Sperlonga, and the Etruscan component was terrific.) The Persian component at Bryn Mawr was presented by Carl Nylander, who was at Bryn Mawr for seven years. There we really had debates. Carl Nylander and I had wonderful discussions. We disagreed beautifully and we were very good friends. And that again opened up a whole new area for me.

SMITH: So what did you disagree about?

RIDGWAY: It was funny things. He used to say that I had a housewife approach and that for me history was the kings and the rulers, and I would tell him that he wasn't looking at sculpture with real eyes. In any case, these were points of detail (what was Greek or not Greek about sculpture at Persepolis), and we are very good friends. Having to deal with scholars who were involved with other cultures was a terrific help to me. I never had a strong Roman component anywhere within Bryn Mawr. With Roman, to some extent, it's familiarity that breeds contempt, because I had had Roman all around me, and I had always seen Roman things. I became really

interested in Roman more through teaching it myself. I had had a course in Roman . . . that's right. The other seminar that I had had with Jacopi was on the age of Augustus, so I did the jewelry and the cameos and the *Boscoreale* (cups from a specific site near Pompeii), and that kind of thing, but that was still in Italy. Carpenter didn't do very much with Roman. Mary Swindler I think used to teach Roman, but she didn't in my days. So I had never really had any formal training in Roman beyond the age of Augustus.

I found Roman fascinating for techniques. I looked at Roman more when I was trying to determine what was Greek and what was Roman. Roman to me is not quite as vital as Greek is. I like it, and I know enough, I hope, but I don't consider myself a Romanist by any stretch of the imagination. This is why when they asked me to give the [Thomas Spencer] Jerome Lectures (in 1981–82), I was really pretty worried. You're supposed to present a Roman subject, and the only thing I could think of was Roman copies of Greek sculpture, which turned out to be okay, but nobody believed what I was saying at the time (that most "copies" are really no such thing, and do not replicate a specific Greek original). I gave those lectures and people sort of pooh-poohed my ideas. Now of course it's a very popular area of study, and everybody has invented the egg. But then it was a little bit too early. People couldn't agree with it at all.

SMITH: Did you have any training in chemistry or geology—the practical aspects of

archaeology?

RIDGWAY: No, and I always regret that my training in the field came with the Italian School, because Doro Levi, the director of the Italian School at the time, was a universal scholar and a Renaissance man, but he was also very autocratic. I arrived from the American School having read all the reports on Phaestos, because Miss Mellink always made me read them. Since they were written in Italian, it was natural. So I had read everything that had been written on the palace of Phaestos, and Levi thought that I had a great deal of knowledge. He didn't realize that it was purely book knowledge and I really had no excavation experience. He put me in a place where he thought that I could do no harm, and he said, "You can excavate this freely; it's a dump." Even my untrained eye, after a while, could see that it was stratified. I kept telling him that it was stratified, and he kept saying, "No, no no. It's a dump." So I wasn't keeping notes and I wasn't taking measurements, because he said not to bother. He was so sure. Then after a while he came to me and said, "You know, you are right; it's stratified." By that time we had thrown all sorts of things away.

So I thought, "I am not cut out for this kind of work." I just didn't want to do it; it was too much responsibility. If I had had the training that people at the American School in Athens had, which really was wonderful, I may have felt differently. There were some people there who were asked to excavate in the Agora. One of the things that upset me was that there were some pure philologists who really

weren't archaeologists at all, and they were asked to excavate but I was not. That's why I had to go to the Italian School and ask, "Can I excavate with you?" They thought since I knew so much about Phaestos, surely I could.

LYONS: There was no Corinth (training) excavation?

RIDGWAY: There was no Corinth then, no.

LYONS: So Phaestos was your only field experience?

RIDGWAY: Right, and that was a great experience. I think technique in excavating is essential, because you can be very intelligent, but if you don't know how to establish a grid or how to measure, and so on— In principle, yes, of course I have read all the excavation reports, I have been to sites. One of the things that I enjoy very much is to go and look at excavations, but I have no patience for doing it myself. That's not my forte.

SMITH: Evelyn Harrison, who took classes with Carpenter, mentioned the way he would put an object on the table and get people to talk about it and look at it.

RIDGWAY: No, he didn't do that with me. He never gave me an object. Eve Harrison had one year at Bryn Mawr, as a graduate student. She has a tremendous eye for sculpture; she really knows the material. Because she has worked in the Agora for so long, she has a knowledge of sculpture that is unequalled. My knowledge doesn't begin to match hers. I'm not saying this for false modesty, I'm saying it because I have worked primarily with slides and with museum objects, and

she has worked with fragments.

I have had to do three museum catalogs. When you do a catalog, you are confronted with something that is out of context; you have not chosen it. Then you really learn a lot, but I don't begin to have Eve's knowledge of the techniques. I do have a wider sense of sculpture because I am also interested in Magna Graecia and Sicily, whereas she is primarily interested in Athens, but what she knows about Athenian sculpture I can't begin to touch.

SMITH: When you got married, did you know that you were going to be teaching at Bryn Mawr?

RIDGWAY: Oh, I got married already with the position, and I never stopped teaching. Bryn Mawr paid me the palatial sum of $2400 a year. My husband was making $2000 at the time, because he had taken whatever job he could get in order for me to be able to stay in the Bryn Mawr area. We didn't have any money; the first child came almost on the anniversary of the marriage and therefore he was not covered by insurance, so I had to go to a clinic. We didn't have any money at all. I wasn't going to ask my Italian family for help after I had made all that fuss about marrying an American, you realize that. My husband's family was not going to do anything because the Quakers are that way, you know; you have to walk on your own feet. So we did, but it was rough.

When we had the first child, I used to trade one hour of Italian for one hour of

babysitting, because I had to teach. Anne [Coffin] Hanson, who then became quite a famous art historian at Yale, was writing her Ph.D. dissertation on a piazza in [Siena], the Fonte Gaia, and she needed Italian. (At the time she was a graduate student in art history at Bryn Mawr.) She already had three children of her own, so she was much more experienced than I, who never had anything to do with babies. So she would do one hour of babysitting for me, and then I would come home and we would do one hour of Italian. At the beginning it was rough, but I never stopped.

I was under the impression that my work was also important for the family, but the other day my husband reminded me that, yes, it was important for the family and it certainly gave the family a lot of advantages that we wouldn't have had otherwise, but he really was letting me do what I wanted to do because he saw how much I loved it. Otherwise, we probably could have tried to live on his salary. He would have tried to do something else. But I loved archaeology and I loved teaching. As a matter of fact, the one thing that really I regretted about retiring was that I would no longer teach. What I hate is all the paperwork, all the committees, all these other kinds of things. Unfortunately, that follows you no matter what. I will go to my grave writing recommendations. They find me no matter where I am. [laughter] But teaching I enjoy, very much.

SMITH: How did your tenured position at Bryn Mawr develop?

RIDGWAY: In those days it wasn't a major issue at all. Nor was publishing a major

issue, thank goodness. Whenever I gave Miss Mellink one of my articles, saying I would like to publish it, she would say, "Why don't you think about it a little bit longer?" So instead of encouraging me to publish, she would hold me back. Miss Mellink has always been like this. It wasn't something that she was doing to me particularly. This was her own mental attitude: one has to think a little bit longer about things. But I got excited about an idea and I wanted to put it out, so after a while I didn't listen to her anymore. Nobody said, "You have to publish, otherwise we'll throw you out," so it never occurred to me. Now, Miss [Katharine] McBride, who was the president at Bryn Mawr in my days, was determined to get her pound of flesh out of everybody. She had most of the people doing volunteer work.

[Tape II, Side One]

RIDGWAY: When Bryn Mawr called me back, I had expected them to pay my moving expenses. Miss McBride wasn't going to do it. In a way, Miss Mellink encouraged me to go away for one year, because then I could come back as assistant professor, and [Miss McBride] couldn't have done anything about it. She would have kept me as an instructor forever. So, from that point of view, I was completely unaware of procedures. I wasn't trying to obtain anything. Whatever happened, happened by itself. I wasn't pushing for anything. I am the least political person that you can think of. It took me quite a while to become aware of all these things.

SMITH: So it was Dr. Mellink, then, who got you a position as an assistant

professor, and then you got promoted to associate professor?

RIDGWAY: Right, but I don't even know how much Miss Mellink pushed one way or another. At one point I came due for my sabbatical and Miss Mellink said, "Oh, you can't go on sabbatical, I'm excavating." I wasn't even going to have a sabbatical. In those days there wasn't even junior-faculty leave. When I had my third son, in October, Miss Mellink said, "Don't worry, you can take a whole week off." So I took a whole week off, and I was terrified of losing my job. Then I found out that you could have had a whole month of maternity leave, but Miss Mellink wasn't going to tell me that.

It was held against me, practically, that I was having all these children. Miss Mellink said, "Well, you know, there was a time when we would have made you sign on the dotted line that you were not going to have any more children." I was trying not to have any children at all, if you can believe it. It just didn't work out very well. After the fourth one I did have an operation, because my husband could look at me, (so to speak!) and I had a child; it was really ridiculous. It's not that we didn't try, but it wasn't working out. So after the operation, fortunately, I stopped having children. But certainly the college wasn't very sympathetic. I didn't know when I was supposed to come up for tenure or anything; it just happened. One day I was told that I had tenure.

SMITH: Well, that's nice.

RIDGWAY: With Miss Mellink being the way she was, even if she didn't say anything, you always felt that you had to give 150 percent, and it wasn't because of tenure, it was in order to live up to this expectation that this woman had of you. In a way, it was almost a continuation of my mother, who always said, "I don't have to praise you when you do the right thing, I only have to point out to you when you do something wrong." Miss Mellink was very much the same. I don't think she ever praised me for anything that I did right, but if I did something wrong she would let me know.

SMITH: When did the department start to grow?

RIDGWAY: Let's see . . . when I came back from Hollins College [Roanoke, Virginia]—I was there only one year (1960–61)—we had another person, because Miss Swindler had really retired by that time, and Carpenter also had retired. I filled Cambitoglou's position. So there was Miss Mellink, myself, and there was an English man, Martin Harrison, who was wonderful. We shared an office, because as usual Bryn Mawr never has enough office rooms, but he only stayed one year and left. By that time it was quite clear that we really needed another person, and that's when Kyle Phillips came. Then when Kyle Phillips was with us, and Machteld was excavating every first semester, it was decided that by now we were attracting enough graduate students that we needed one more person. That was when Carl Nylander came. Then he pushed to get Dick Ellis to come.

So eventually we expanded to five, and that was a very good thing, because when somebody was going on sabbatical we didn't need to have a replacement because we overlapped enough. For instance, I could teach the introductory course in Egypt and Mesopotamia even though that was not my field. We had enough overlap that we could teach each other's courses.

SMITH: Were you thinking about how to design a program?

RIDGWAY: Yes, but Machteld was the one who was doing most of the thinking because she was chairman for something like twenty-five years, I think. We always voted her in because she was a great chairman. There wasn't so much a philosophical idea. We certainly wanted to cover all the areas, and we wanted very much to make sure that the students were exposed to classical *and* Near Eastern, that they didn't have an isolationist approach to culture. But otherwise I don't know that we said specifically, "We want more theory." I think to some extent this is really coming to the fore now because jobs have become so very difficult for people. Also, then you could take it for granted that people would come with some Greek or Latin, and now they don't come with Greek and Latin, so finding a job is really very difficult. You really have to plan differently.

SMITH: How have your courses changed over the last thirty years?

RIDGWAY: In the sense of what I was teaching?

SMITH: What you teach and how you teach. First, what you've taught.

RIDGWAY: Well, I taught the introductory course (Archaeology 101/102, which included Egypt, Mesopotamia, the Hittites, Aegean prehistory, Greek, Etruscan, and Roman archaeology) for something like thirty-five years, and of course I changed it. I never kept a list of slides. I am amused to see that even here [at Florida State University] the professors in art history come with a list of slides. I have never, never kept a list of slides, because I wanted to keep myself fresh to consider new monuments and new comparisons that I could make. Certainly I would try to tell them the basics, but I would always do it a little bit differently so that I wouldn't go stale. So I used to teach the introductory course, and then I used to teach Greek and Roman sculpture and Greek architecture. Other people took over the Greek architecture, but it has always been my interest, so every now and then I taught it. I once even taught vase painting—unworthily, but I did teach it.

By and large I did a lot of supervision of honors, of M.A.s, and I had my graduate seminars. The graduate seminars were always "problems in," and I have never taught the same seminar twice. Even though I would teach archaic sculpture, or architectural sculpture more than once, it would always be a different problem and a different approach, according to what interested me and according to what I was doing. Many times we asked the students what they wanted to do, and they came up with all sorts of peculiar ideas and then you would try to accommodate them. One year Gloria [Ferrari] Pinney and I taught an Etruscan/Greek seminar together. I

would do it from the Greek point of view, she from the Etruscan point of view. I taught a seminar with Carl Nylander on Greece and Persia. I taught a seminar on Hellenistic portraiture with Robert Fleischer (of the University of Mainz in Germany) when he was the Kress Professor. We did a variety of things like that. It was fun. I never knew what I was going to teach. Now I think they are trying to structure it more to make sure that the students get certain things. But that was the beauty of being at Bryn Mawr; you really could teach archaeology at that higher level.

LYONS: You involved the graduate students a great deal, as I remember, in the seminars, and often their ideas are visible in your books.

RIDGWAY: Oh, absolutely. I always acknowledged the students. There was a great deal of give and take. Even if somebody else was supervising the student, that student was always free to come and talk to all of us. We always encouraged the students to go and talk to everybody; that made it more interesting.

SMITH: Now, when you were a graduate student there, I think you said there were three students in your group.

RIDGWAY: Yes, it was completely different.

SMITH: I presume it would be in the sixties that the expansion starts.

RIDGWAY: Yes, it expanded a great deal.

SMITH: How did that decision to expand the graduate program come about?

RIDGWAY: I don't think it was a decision, I think it was the department attracting

more and more applicants. The more of us there were, the more applicants there were, because we became known. Also, Miss Mellink, with her excavations, became quite well known. I think that that was what did it, too. To some extent Penn went a little bit downhill, because when Rodney Young died the department was no longer the same, so then some of the people that would have applied to Penn under normal circumstances would apply to Bryn Mawr. In Princeton, Richard Stillwell retired, and Erik Sjöqvist, and some of the people that would have applied to Princeton started applying to Bryn Mawr. So I think it was due also to what was happening elsewhere.

Bryn Mawr has always had a fantastic library; that was also a bonus that attracted students. It was such a plus, to be able to use the Bryn Mawr library. Miss McBride once told me, yes, I was making a very small salary, but I should almost pay them for the privilege of teaching at Bryn Mawr. So that was the attitude. That was typical. Once my husband and I went to her with a fair-housing petition. I wanted to get her signature. It was Sunday afternoon, and she was very indignant that I was circulating a petition from door to door. I said I was doing it on my own time, and she said, "My dear, when you teach at Bryn Mawr, there is no such thing as your own time." There! [laughter] We were brainwashed a lot at Bryn Mawr in the early days. There is a different world out there today.

SMITH: When did you start having your own graduate students?

RIDGWAY: My very first Ph.D. was Nancy Bookidis, but I was teaching all the

others too, and in those days there was even senior conference (like a graduate seminar). The very first year, I had three wonderful senior students. Miranda Marvin was one of them. I still remember my first undergraduate students. The undergraduates were very strong; sometimes they were stronger than the graduate students. But then again it wasn't a question of *my* students; everybody was studying with everybody else. You just selected a dissertation in a certain topic because it interested you; it wasn't so much a question of wanting to do it with a particular professor.

SMITH: Did you often suggest topics to your students?

RIDGWAY: Occasionally, yes, but the students had their own ideas. I supervised a dissertation by Susan Handler Auth, on architecture and numismatics, and I certainly am not a numismatist. (We asked a numismatist from the Numismatic Society to help, toward the end.)

SMITH: In a small department it would seem like teachers and students would become very close, but as the department grows bigger, then it's more difficult to have that close interaction.

RIDGWAY: Oh no, we were still very close to the students, because you really saw them day and night. They were chained to the seminar room, because the books are noncirculating, and we were chained to our offices. I couldn't have worked at home because with the four children there was no way that I could have any books at home.

As a matter of fact, I now find out how difficult it is, because all my slides have been given to Bryn Mawr. Now that I have retired, I have no slides of my own; they are all Bryn Mawr's. I see all these professors with their own collections. I never had enough room, I never had a place at home. Now that they have kicked me out of my office I shall have to give all my books to the library. I can't take them home, because by now we are in a two-room apartment. That hurts because I love my books, but what can I do?

LYONS: How did you balance having four little children and this more than full-time job?

RIDGWAY: You learn to be very efficient. You also learn to shut out the noise. To this day I can work in the middle of the subway and the noise won't bother me. If somebody wants to talk to me they really have to shake me and make eye contact and make sure that I really am listening to them, because I can even answer and not be aware that somebody is talking to me. Simply because you need to isolate yourself. Especially when the children started having money of their own: each one bought their own stereo, and they would all play four different things. The noise was unbelievable. You turn it off. You can, however, always hear the cry for help—the car used to drive to the Bryn Mawr Hospital emergency room by itself. You know, four boys were pretty rambunctious.

Our fourth child had crib death when he was five months old, so he is

disabled. But, thank goodness, he is a live wire and he has done a great deal. I had to go and breast-feed him when he was in the oxygen tent, because he refused to take a bottle. At the time of crisis, obviously, he needed the contact even more. So I would spend my nights in the hospital and my days teaching. Miss Mellink never said a word, other than, "Well, it's good for you to keep a stiff upper lip." She is not inhuman; she really sincerely believes that that was the best for me. Maybe it was, maybe it was . . . because, who knows, I might have fallen apart if I had had more time to think about it. That way, I just really ran with the punches all the time. But my husband is a terrific husband, and if he hadn't taken so much of a share in the family I certainly could not have done it.

I have always said, in all my books and to my students, that the children really gave balance to my life. I couldn't have been a pure scholar; that, I know, would have driven me crazy. And I couldn't have been a pure mother either; that would have driven me crazy much faster. So I needed something that was strong enough to pull me away from my books but also something that was strong enough to pull me away from my children, and I think the two activities really worked out perfectly.

I love archaeology, I really do, and I retired in order to do more work. People say, "Why are you still writing?" I am not doing it because I want honors. I have received a lot of honors in my life; as a matter of fact, probably more than I deserved. I have never really sought them; they have come as a corollary, because I have

always done what I really loved to do. Sometimes—I will have to say this quite honestly—I was not necessarily worthy of the honors. When they gave me the AIA [Archaeological Institute of America] gold medal they phoned me in Greece, and the connection was terrible; you couldn't hear anything. Jim Wiseman (the AIA president at the time) said he wanted to talk to me about the gold medal. I had been nominating Miss Mellink forever, so I thought that it was for her, so I said, "Oh, good! You are giving it to Miss Mellink." He said, "We are giving it to you." I said I didn't want to accept it, because really from the point of view of excavation, archaeology, and so on, the woman had it all over me. Jim said I could not refuse the medal, but I felt terrible that I would get it before Machteld Mellink.

When Machteld got the medal herself, Jim Wiseman came to me and said, "Now can you rest in peace?" Now, yes, I can, but I still think she should have gotten it before me. I don't think that that was right; the woman is incredible. Except that she doesn't show it. I am all Italian opera, and I talk your head off. So, in a way, things come my way not because I am looking for them, but because I express more. I have been very much in demand as a speaker because I don't read; I talk to the slides, so people enjoy that. But it isn't really that I am so much better than the person who reads and is very monotonous and very dull but is really very scholarly. So some of it is really the Italian component.

SMITH: What kind of work was your husband doing?

RIDGWAY: My husband comes from a broken family. His parents were divorced, and it wasn't even a nice divorce. His father was a fierce Quaker who went through three wives. He was really the kind of person who thinks of the public good first and the family comes last. So Pete was brought up in a very tough way. He was working for his father when we decided to get married, and his father was a horticulturist, with his own consultant firm. My husband probably would have taken over for his father, although he didn't have his father's horticultural knowledge, but he didn't, because I had to be at Bryn Mawr and he couldn't be in New Jersey with his father. He had done his military service in the air force and was a medic, and that was recognized by the veteran's hospital, so he was in physical therapy and rehabilitation. He was not a physical therapist, because he doesn't have a degree in that, but they recognized his training. So that's why his pay was also minimal. On the other hand, he was very pleased about the fact that by not having the official title he didn't have to do the paperwork, he could just work with the patients, and that is what he loved.

He converted to Catholicism, but it's skin deep. What he wanted to do was really to help people, and he's very good at that; he has enormous patience, which I don't have. He worked for thirty-five years in physical therapy and rehabilitation, and that gave him a lot of satisfaction. To me it was a great bonus. One, because he didn't have the same pressures that I had, because he didn't have an academic year. Two, because his patients were not going to get well or get bad overnight; these were

all long-range processes. Three, because the veteran's hospital allowed him to take days off. He could have taken his whole yearly leave one day at a time, so that if one of our children had to be taken to the doctor, or sports, or if there was something important, he could take a day off, whereas if I had to teach a class, I had to teach a class; there was nothing I could do. At Bryn Mawr you just don't cut classes.

SMITH: By the way, what was the teaching load at Bryn Mawr at that time?

RIDGWAY: Officially, let's say, on paper, in my days it was two undergraduate courses and one seminar per semester. But the supervision falls wherever it falls, so you can have another ten hours of contact with the students per week and that doesn't show up on any form. And because we were always in the library, and because it was open door policy, the students were in and out. Also, I was the undergraduate and graduate advisor. Sometimes there were lines at my office door. Now they are trying to do two-three; that is to say, one undergraduate course and one seminar one semester, and then two undergraduate courses and one seminar the other semester, so it's a little bit lighter. The chairman now has one course less. But it's a very heavy teaching load. For instance, if you have graduate students in your undergraduate courses, you are supposed to give them extra work for graduate credit, so you meet with them an extra hour a week. That doesn't count as extra load, that's just the way it is. So there is a lot of unspoken work that goes on at Bryn Mawr. Bryn Mawr fairly kills people. I have a witness here; I am not making it up, you know. [To

Lyons:] You remember when Gloria Pinney was in the hospital and she came out for your exam?

LYONS: Yes, I remember.

RIDGWAY: She had to have an emergency minor operation, she was in the hospital, but she got up and came over for a prelim and then went back to the hospital. This was just the general expectation. Most of the professors at Bryn Mawr either were not married, or if they were married they didn't have children. To have married people with children was really surprising at one point. A lot was expected. Also, and I must say this, even though it might sound unbelievable, more was expected from women than from men. Kyle Phillips got away with murder. I was complaining that I was carrying my load and his load, because he was never there, or if he was there he wasn't paying attention to the students, and they would come to me and ask me all the things that they should have asked him. Miss Mellink never touched him, whereas I was expected to do everything, no matter what. I had to be forgiven for "running off and getting married;" that was the expression. I had "run off and got married."

LYONS: I was going to ask you about your perceptions of the place of women in classical archaeology.

RIDGWAY: I don't think that Machteld was aware of that sort of thing. I think she just automatically assumed that a woman had to carry the load. Mabel Lang, the

professor of Greek, once said something to me that hurt me very deeply. She's another major figure, highly respected, a woman that I admire very much, but she's also very caustic, and she said to me one day, "Hey, Machteld hired you because she knew a workhorse when she saw one." I was hoping that I had a little bit more to offer than just being a workhorse, but in the long run that's what it was. I had to stay home and tend the fires when Machteld and Kyle went excavating, but it wasn't as if I was not working too. Writing a book is just as committed as doing an excavation. But for Machteld the fieldwork and things like this were very important.

SMITH: Was having four children a factor in your not doing much in the way of fieldwork?

RIDGWAY: No, I probably would never have done fieldwork. It was a factor when I was asked to be the Mellon Professor at the American School, or when I was asked about taking on the directorship of the School; I had to say no, because obviously I couldn't transplant the family. So there were things I knew I could not do. I could not go to Greece every summer the way people did. I couldn't afford to. I couldn't go to European museums, I couldn't go to international congresses the way everybody else did, because I didn't have that kind of money. I couldn't have left the family that easily.

SMITH: Bryn Mawr didn't have the support?

RIDGWAY: Very little, very little. And it was also a question of the family. But

fieldwork, no. I really would not have wanted to do fieldwork; that's not my interest. In that respect I was not victimized in the least. If I had wanted to, I could have done it.

SMITH: In terms of Bryn Mawr being a preeminent women's school, was there an orientation coming from Miss McBride down that you had special responsibilities as a female professor at a women's university?

RIDGWAY: No, I don't know that there was. Also, don't forget that I was coming from Italy, where my own mother had the equivalent of a university degree, so to me it wasn't extraordinary. Women in Italy have always gone to the university, and when I went to the university all my friends were women, so it didn't seem strange to me. I had not realized the obstacles that existed for American women, nor had I realized that there were fields that were considered more appropriate for a woman. I was always made to think that I could do whatever I wanted; there was never any worry that way. So I didn't quite understand it for quite a while. But at Bryn Mawr there were so many women who were major scholars; it was a very good atmosphere. By the time I began to understand more, I realized how important it was, especially at the undergraduate level, to give women a chance to be whatever they wanted to be.

So I completely believed in Bryn Mawr, and to this day I have the greatest devotion and affection for it. I think the standards of scholarship that they have are wonderful. The idea of always going to the primary source, always checking your

references, not leaving anything out—all this becomes absolutely ingrained in you. It was not so much Miss McBride as Machteld Mellink who demanded such a high standard. And, in a way, you were delighted to respond to that kind of standard, because it was a wonderful approach.

They had an honor system at Bryn Mawr that was the opposite of the honor system in Italian universities. In Italy, you were supposed to help your friends when they were taking an exam; you were dishonorable if you didn't help them to pass. Here at Bryn Mawr, the honor system was, you don't cheat and you don't have to be supervised. The professor gives the exam and leaves the classroom. The students police themselves. If you stay in the classroom the students are furious. I thought that that was great. I really liked the fact that there was student self government and that there was this kind of honesty. Now, obviously, there might be every now and then the person who goes astray, but it's all the more remarkable because it's an unusual case, and you can see that that is the general standard of the college. So I love Bryn Mawr for that.

SMITH: In 1963 *The Feminine Mystique* appears and you begin to have women talking about their place in society in a more intense way. It's beginning to become an issue in American life at about the time that you are beginning your career. At this point you had been a professor for five years.

RIDGWAY: But, you see, to me it wasn't a career. That is a mistake that everybody

makes because they say, "Oh, you have had such a wonderful career." I was not trying to have a career. As a matter of fact, there was a big debate with my husband whether I should buy my academic gown or not and finally he gave in and said, "Okay, buy it, because I see that nobody can get you out of there." He kept waiting to see after the fourth child whether I was finally going to give it up and say I couldn't cope anymore. It wasn't really a career, I was doing what I wanted to do, what I loved to do. I wasn't trying to get from here to there. I've never tried to get from here to there; it has happened, but it wasn't an issue of a career. Now, if you had told me, "You cannot do this," then you would have seen me jump on my high horse and really do things, but nobody ever said that to me. At Bryn Mawr I could do anything I wanted.

SMITH: At the end of the 1960s, women's consciousness-raising groups begin appearing.

RIDGWAY: Yes, I had a student who is now quite a famous archaeologist, and I'm very pleased about this. She was a mediocre student, and she came to me and said, "You are really messing me up." I said, "What do you mean, I am messing you up?" She said, "I was told that I was going to college just to get a degree, and then I would get married and that would be it. And here you are, being married, having children, and yet continuing with your career, so which is which?" I said, "You know, it's really up to you." Well, this woman in her senior year changed completely. She put

out tremendously, she really excelled, she went on to graduate school, and now she is a major archaeologist. But she thought that she was just going to school to get a degree because that was the proper thing to do, so she was putting out half an effort. She is married, fortunately, but she has no children.

LYONS: Could you say who it is?

RIDGWAY: You know who she is.

LYONS: I'm sure I must know her, but there could be several possibilities.

SMITH: Maybe that's the point; it could be any number of women in schools all across the country.

RIDGWAY: Yes, and much as I didn't realize it, I was a role model. At one point I even wanted to go to Miss McBride and say, "I'm such a role model I ought to be paid extra," but that wouldn't have cut any water.

SMITH: The sixties is the period of the "sexual revolution," quote unquote. Were there problems in terms of the students demanding more freedom and wanting to get rid of what they used to call *in loco parentis*, where the school took the place of the parents?

RIDGWAY: I didn't see very much of that. Of course, students came in and talked to me a lot, but not about these kinds of things. Students started dressing poorly, and that was a surprise to me; people were going around with holes in their sweaters, and there was one girl that I was sure was starving herself to death. I even suggested that

I lend her some money, and this got around to Miss Mellink, who came to me and said, "Her weekly allowance could keep your whole family, so don't worry, she has plenty of money." The more money she had, the more holes she had in her clothes. So there was that phenomenon.

I'll never forget it: there was a major debate about whether we should cancel classes at the time when there was the war with Cambodia. It was in May, and it was a blistering hot night. We were having this big debate because, being a Quaker institution, the question was, Do we really declare openly that we are against this invasion, or should we let everybody be free to do what they want to do? If we didn't say anything, wouldn't it look as if we approved of the war? The discussion went on endlessly, because faculty love to talk. At one point, we heard a clatter up the fire escape and we thought, "Oh my word, this is going to be terrible, the students are rebelling," because all over other campuses there was major unrest. You remember, the students were demonstrating and there was bloodshed. Instead, at Bryn Mawr, the students very respectfully had brought us ice cream, because they realized that the poor faculty had been there for a long time and it was very hot. So they interrupted the faculty meeting, we ate ice cream, and then the students went away and we continued the discussion.

Another time, the students wanted to do a sit-in, so they went to the president and said, "When would it be convenient for us to have a sit-in?" It was a completely

different atmosphere. Also, by and large, the faculty was all behind the students; we all agreed on those principles. It was a very liberal kind of faculty. There was such an overwhelming consensus that those who were not so liberal never had the nerve to speak, I'm afraid, and that might not have been so good.

SMITH: Do you have any questions about student life and teaching?

LYONS: Are we going to come back and talk about some graduate advisees?

SMITH: Yes.

RIDGWAY: Am I giving you what you want? I'm doing stream of consciousness.

SMITH: This is fine, yes.

RIDGWAY: And I am being completely honest, as you know. I am glad that Claire [Lyons] is here because she has lived through this herself, so she knows what the situation was like. Am I misrepresenting anything?

LYONS: No, not at all.

RIDGWAY: Of course I have my own perceptions. I'm sure that if you talk to Miss Mellink she will have a completely different perception, and never for a minute will she realize that she was rough on me, because she didn't mean to be. That in its way was the most baffling aspect, because if I had thought, "This woman hates me and she is doing it on purpose," I could have taken objection to it, but she was completely unaware of it.

SMITH: You said your husband was active in the civil rights movement, and you

were a little bit as well?

RIDGWAY: Oh, I was very much into it in principle. I was laboring under a misconception, because I was Catholic. When there were all the troubles at Folcroft— You may be too young to remember, but Folcroft is one of the suburbs around Philadelphia. A black family moved into the area. The man was a technician and his wife was something else, I can't remember. They were completely respectable, hard-working people, so it wasn't even a question of saying, "They are turning this into a ghetto," but they were terribly mistreated. Rocks were thrown into their house, and all sorts of things. It turned out that this was a highly Catholic neighborhood, so I said to my husband, "My word, all you have to do is go talk to the priest and tell him to say from the pulpit that this is not the way to treat people." My husband said it won't work that way. I said, "You don't believe it because you are not really Catholic. Let's go talk to the priest and you will see." Did I learn my lesson! The priest said, "On the contrary, I am not going to say a word, because all these people have invested their savings in this neighborhood, and it is going to go down." I was so disappointed and so disgusted. Being Italian, I had not grown up with this problem, so to me it was perfectly normal that you should accept everybody no matter what. You had class distinctions in Italy but not race distinctions. I think now we have the problem of racism even in Italy, which I think is dreadful.

Everything I was brought up with was against the idea of racial discrimination

and I had no sense of it in this country. So when my husband and his father were very active in the civil rights movement, I obviously was very much in favor of it. We were involved in several demonstrations, and we took the children to peace marches. Pete went to Mississippi with his father and his sister to build a community center. I was terrified because they had killed some of the social workers at the time in Mississippi, and there he was, and I was home with the four children. I was really scared. The faculty at one point was asked whether any of us would want to go and teach in a southern black school for a while, and I promptly volunteered, but of course nobody wanted archaeology, so I didn't have anything to offer. My father-in-law had taught at Hampton Institute for many years, and Pete had been brought up therefore on a black campus. Pete's father "saved the world"; he was on every committee that you can think of. He didn't have five minutes of time for his family, but he was in all the committees; it was perhaps a little bit excessive, but of course that was the way Pete had been brought up, and he and I were very much in agreement.

SMITH: What do your four sons do?

RIDGWAY: None of them are academic. I tried to keep my hands off their studies because I didn't want them to think that because I was the college professor I was pushing them. So they have done different things. The first one [Conrad] got his degree in psychology at Ithaca College. He didn't want to go to Cornell because he

couldn't see the lake from there—peculiar reasons for choosing one college over another. Also, the lacrosse team was much better at Ithaca College than it was at Cornell. So the first thing he did was blow out his knee and he had to have a major operation, so he couldn't be on the lacrosse team.

After he got his degree, he came home to have this knee operation, because he had put it off for several years, through college, and then it really came to roost and he had to have the operation. So he was cooped in his room for a while, and when he came out he was foaming at the mouth. He got the first job he could get, which was in a restaurant. He advanced fairly rapidly and had, I would say, quite a career as a restaurant manager, even though he had not trained for it. But then, when he got married and he started having children of his own, he realized he was never home, so he left the restaurant line and he now works for a company that provides supplies for restaurants.

The second son [Eric] was really going full force in geology, and he was "all but the dissertation" when he decided to go to Kenya and teach with World Teach, the program from Harvard, you know—another project to save the world. So he went to Kenya, he lived in the bush for one year, he got malaria, he ate termites, he did all these kinds of things. He came back from Kenya, gave up geology and went into counseling. He got another master's, in counseling, he married another counselor, and now he is in northern Idaho. He has lots of clients, especially

juveniles, people that are being referred to him by judges and doctors, and so on.

The third son [Kevin] really was a major mess. In a way, even though he has straightened out from the point of view of becoming an honest citizen, he is obviously quite unhappy. We are beginning to think that it was probably the fact that his younger brother, Christopher, had crib death at five months, because that meant years of therapy and hospital stays. We had to spend lots of time with Christopher, and it probably hit Kevin just when he was vulnerable. We had been seeing his counselor for this in California (when I was at Berkeley, from August to December of '96), and this came out. We didn't realize all of this, but he obviously felt abandoned. What could we have done? I had to be at the hospital with Christopher. So Kevin went astray for a while, did drugs, and so on. As soon as he was eighteen, my husband threw him out of the house. We were quite worried, because he could have gone either way. Instead, that really straightened him out. He went to live with his older brother and eventually told us that he was ready to go to college. He went to college, got his degree, and maybe because he was influenced by his older brother's career, he graduated from Florida International with a degree in hotel and restaurant management. Of course, he got a job before he even finished, because those skills are very much in demand.

He went to California with his first job, and he too moved from restaurant to restaurant, getting higher and higher, so we thought he was a great success story.

But evidently he was unhappy; he had other ideas about himself, I don't know. For a while he tried to be a financial consultant, and now he is the membership manager at an enormous fitness club where they have something like a hundred of those machines that Californians are completely crazy about. It's an enormous complex, really fantastic. But he's unhappy about it, he really is, and I think he has not found himself. His expectations of himself are probably bigger than what he has been able to achieve. Maybe he wanted to make a lot of money, I don't know, but that is something that is not in the family. Nobody has ever made a lot of money in this family.

The fourth son is the one who is disabled. But he has made a lot of himself *because* he is disabled. He has become a complete extrovert, and he has devoted his life to helping the disabled. He also has a learning disability, but he got his college degree, and he really has overcome all these obstacles in his own way. He got his B.S. in therapeutic recreation. Then he was going to graduate school for counseling in Colorado, but somebody introduced him to wheelchair racing, and he was very good at that from the very beginning. So he went to Barcelona at the time of the Paralympics, in 1992, and he won three bronze medals. We were really very proud of him. Then he started doing ski instruction for the disabled, so he never really finished his masters, which I'm sorry about, because he had spent four years in graduate school.

He came back to our area and he got a job, but then they cut the funds. Now he is partly employed at a rehabilitation hospital during the weekends. His work as a ski instructor and coach at disabled camps unfortunately is volunteer. They do pay him to lecture. He was at the Atlanta Paralympics (in 1996) and he made all the finals, but he didn't get any medals this time. But it doesn't matter, he is still an Olympian, and of course he is very much in demand for lectures. His own university has him as consultant for the disabled there. I am very proud of him, because I think he is as normal as you can be with this kind of disability. He is permanently on crutches.

[Tape II, Side Two]

SMITH: You were saying you were in the ward, talking to the nurse (who was explaining why the doctor had ordered some tests for an apparently healthy baby).

RIDGWAY: Right, because if I had only been in the parking lot (instead of being already in the ward), Christopher would have died by the time I took him in. (He was just being admitted for tests; he had no symptoms at the time.) He just turned blue, very suddenly, and the nurse grabbed him out of my hands and called the alarm. At first they thought it was maybe pneumonia, and then he had a second suffocation attack after he had been under treatment in the oxygen tent, so they realized it wasn't that. They didn't know what it was, they tried a variety of things, they had some of the best doctors of the Philadelphia area. This went on until he was two years old,

and then evidently he outgrew these attacks of suffocation. But his balance centers had been touched by the lack of oxygen, so he never walked. He only crawled for quite a while, and he had to have a series of operations. They cut his tendons behind his knees so that he could straighten them out, and he had tons of physical therapy.

It's a long story. But, because we were all so sure that he would have died, we were actually quite relieved that he had survived and that he was in reasonably good health. So he has grown up with this, and he doesn't see himself as a poor cripple, he sees himself as a very lucky person. He is so cheerful, he really is a pleasant person to be around. So, if nothing else, if I have done nothing with archaeology, I still have done something with that one son. I might have messed up Kevin, but I don't know what to do. It kills me. I tell you, it's not been easy.

LYONS: But it sounds like he's going forward.

RIDGWAY: I have no idea, I don't know. He's now thirty-six. He should shape up. That is probably my trouble too, you see. I went through a lot in Africa, and it was always from external causes, obviously. The war was not my family's responsibility. The fact that we had nothing to eat, the fact that we didn't know whether we were going to be killed; all of that really didn't undermine the family support. On the contrary, you were sort of taught to resist, to pull your socks up, so to speak. So I probably am not the most sympathetic kind of person, because I thought if I could go through all that and come out of it okay, then people should to some extent keep a

stiff upper lip. Then I found that Machteld Mellink expected exactly the same thing, and she was also coming from a war and the Resistance and everything else, so we had the same kind of mental attitude: you have to survive.

When we went to see Kevin's counselor in California, she said to me, "You are like a Sherman tank." Okay, I am like a Sherman tank. I am an optimist; I always see the best part of life, because I had no childhood, in a way. Therefore I enjoy everything. I don't have to be taken to the opera, or to do all sorts of exciting things. I married a man who also doesn't need that sort of thing either. I enjoy walking around the railroad tracks, so to speak. I can find my enjoyment everywhere. So with Christopher, instead of saying, "Oh, why is my son a cripple," I say, "How wonderful that he's alive, he's intelligent, he's normally active." I am not looking at the negative side; I have to look at the positive side in order to survive. I think that was the war; the war has done that to a lot of people.

Don't underestimate this: I would want to be a good mother before being a good archaeologist. But it might come out, ironically, that I probably was a better archaeologist than I was a mother. I don't know. If you talk to Christopher, he thinks I was a fantastic mother, obviously, because I provided him with what he needed. I have always adored the children. To me that is essential, that is very important. Eric, the counselor, says that we gave him all the wrong ideas about marriage because Pete and I never quarrel. Eric says we are codependent, because

we mesh so well and we are so happy together; we are wonderfully happily married. Of course it was a major decision for me to make, to marry Pete, because I was giving up my country, my nationality, my family, and even my religion to some extent. So I really knew what I was doing before I married him. And I wasn't so young anymore. Pete is so good natured and so easy going. Eric says this isn't natural; this is not the way marriage should be. Pete and I still walk hand in hand when we are out, and we really enjoy each other very much.

I think maybe my life is not what you would call normal. I am not a normal person, but I don't know who is a normal person. I have always thought that I would put my family first, and that archaeology was my leisure time. My husband was allowing me to do what I was doing, and it was very nice of him to put up with a wife who wanted to go away for lectures and teach and do all these things. Yes, indirectly, a lot of advantages accrued to the children. But they came for a special celebration for my retirement (organized by Bryn Mawr in October of 1994), and they were so embarrassed. They would have disappeared under a chair if they could have, because there was all this attention paid to me. When I was giving the Sather [Classical] Lectures in California (1996), Kevin was there one day, and he refused to come to the lectures. Somebody invited him at least for the last one and said, "But are you aware of how distinguished your mother is?" And Kevin said, "No, and I don't want to know." Children don't know. But that's why one day I am going to write a book.

Not to tell them how distinguished I am, but to tell them about all the things I went through in my life.

SMITH: Do you have grandchildren?

RIDGWAY: Yes, two, and they are very nice. They are boys, always boys. I thought it was actually very good that I had boys, because I didn't consider myself as very much of a woman. I don't make-up; I put lipstick on, but that's about it. I don't know how to dress, I hate to shop, I don't do all these feminine things. I was watching Gloria Pinney telling her daughter what was good quality in clothing and what was poor quality, and I was thinking, "Ah, I wouldn't be able to do anything like this for a daughter. Thank goodness I didn't have girls." The boys never took me seriously as a woman; they always were challenging me to do pushups and all these athletic kinds of things. They always took it for granted that a mother did these things, so I really was more of a boy than I was a girl with them. So I am relieved that the grandchildren are boys, at least I know what to do. But only Conrad has children. Eric has no children, and Kevin and Christopher are not married.

LYONS: Do you feel that you've had a different kind of relationship, then, with male graduate students than with women?

RIDGWAY: No, no, because, unfortunately, and I have to say this quite honestly, I have this tendency to consider everybody my children. I feel that all my students are my children, and therefore I have to worry about them and treat them as if they were

an extension of the family. Actually, Lloyd Cotsen, who knew me from the time when we were in Athens, said to me once, "You need an orphanage." At the time I pooh-poohed the idea. But when Christopher was so sick and he was in the hospital, even when he was asleep I couldn't sleep, because there were all those other sick children. I would go around the wards and help the nurses. I felt the universal mother, and this is a terrible thing to feel. Even today I cannot see children suffer, because it's too close to me. So the students were just an extension of that, and I have kept in touch with most of them. It's nice, I like that.

SMITH: That is nice, isn't it?

RIDGWAY: Well, to me it is; teaching has been very rewarding.

SMITH: Maybe we should wrap it up for today. It is an interesting situation at Bryn Mawr: you've got university research expectations but a small college teaching atmosphere. What about faculty turnover? Was that always a problem?

RIDGWAY: By and large, no. On the contrary. It's only in recent years that you see a little bit more turnover. There was one person in my day who left, but he had something like six or seven children, and he went to Temple [University] because they doubled his salary. Now, if they were able to double his salary, you realize that even though he was a full professor at Bryn Mawr, Bryn Mawr wasn't giving him very much money. Bryn Mawr for quite a while was giving people a pittance. I remember very distinctly once that there was a meeting where we wanted to discuss raising

funds in order to increase the faculty salaries. A man got up and said to the president, "Do you realize that your professors get less money than my secretary?" And the president said, "Yes, I realize it but the professors don't." We were quite indignant. Our salaries rated something like 127th in the list of comparable institutions. In recent years they have made a tremendous effort to increase the salaries of the faculty, but there was a time in the sixties and the early seventies where the faculty was rock bottom.

SMITH: Was this partly because it was a women's school, or because of the Quaker background?

RIDGWAY: I don't know. Some of it of course was Miss McBride. She was very tight with money, and maybe she had come through the war too, you see, and she had to make do. Also, Bryn Mawr never had the endowment that other places had, because they never had the professional schools, and they never had undergraduate men. Men are the people who really donate a lot of money. The alumnae are very faithful, but they don't have the possibilities that men have. For quite a while at Bryn Mawr it was even considered beneath the students if they went into law, or one of the other professions. You were supposed to engage in pure, rarefied intellectual pursuit. This was the general attitude. So people didn't go into law school that much, they didn't make a lot of money, and they didn't give it to Bryn Mawr.

SMITH: How many of your undergraduates went on to graduate school? Not

necessarily in archaeology but just generally.

RIDGWAY: A lot, a lot. Many of our undergraduates in archaeology went on in archaeology. In the archaeological world the Bryn Mawr mafia is very deeply infiltrated. I am sure that Claire has seen it.

SMITH: Almost as much as the Michigan mafia.

RIDGWAY: Almost more, because many of the Michigan people are from Bryn Mawr. We send them to Michigan because Michigan is very good. So, basically, when a person comes out of Bryn Mawr with a B.A., we kick them out, because we want them to be exposed to something else, and we send them to Michigan.

SESSION TWO: 27 MARCH, 1997

[Tape III, Side One]

SMITH: I was thinking about what we talked about yesterday, and the various things that you've had to do in your daily and weekly routine when you were active at Bryn Mawr, teaching and writing and balancing a family. Could you recall how you would organize your days and your weeks?

RIDGWAY: I don't think you can talk about organization, because obviously it was catching every five minutes and making sure that I really didn't waste any time. I tried to be home on weekends. Eventually, when we had enough money, we hired a young woman who could live in. We were able to eventually find someone because we were offering weekends off. I wanted to be home with the family on the weekend. In my family, in Italy, we had a nanny throughout; actually, she was my mother's governess, mine, and then she was my niece's governess. She stayed with the family for three generations, her entire life, because when she left she died. So I was used to that kind of thing.

In the beginning, when we didn't have enough money, as I said, Anne Hanson and I traded Italian for babysitting. Then we had someone come for just a few hours. Then we finally started taking people who were already on social security, because they just wanted something else to do. There was a very active grandmother who was in her seventies, and she was very nice, but then her son was sent to Germany—

he was in the service—and she had to go and live with her daughter-in-law, who had a baby. We had a young mother who brought her child because she couldn't find a job otherwise, so she was bringing her child up with ours, but she left. We had a variety of arrangements, but eventually we settled down with this woman, and that was very useful. So I was covered at home. I never tried to do work at home because it was impossible. I was in the office most of the time. Of course, I was available at any time because we lived on campus, and that was one of the great advantages. When I was breast-feeding, for instance, I could easily run home and go back to class.

SMITH: You lived in housing that was actually owned by Bryn Mawr?

RIDGWAY: Yes, there was the so-called faculty row, but we actually have lived on all four sides of the campus. Most of the buildings where we used to live have now been taken down. The college has sort of discontinued this idea of faculty housing. As a matter of fact, the young faculty members don't really want to be on campus; the students would feel free to come and see them at home, so they would never have any time of their own. But for me it was a major help. Also, it was great for the children because they had the run of the campus. So I felt quite safe. They had the kind of facilities we would never have been able to afford for them, such as the swimming pool during the summer and that kind of thing.

I would take the children to school in the morning, then go immediately to my

office. I am a morning person; I tend to do things very early. I would go home for lunch, go back to my office, and come back home for dinner. I don't work at night, but when I work, I work very intensely. I wasn't really trying to do any sustained writing during the academic year. I was trying to write during the summer. I mentioned the fact that I didn't have a sabbatical. I did eventually have one semester's sabbatical, and that was when I wrote my first book. I felt that I had to write the book in six months because I wouldn't have had any other time afterwards. So my books usually are connected to my leaves. That's why you have the rhythm of the books; those were the times when I could take off completely. While I was teaching there was nothing I could do; the teaching and the supervisions were very, very intense. I did a lot of teaching, which meant that I was really thinking problems through, but the most I could write while teaching was an article or a book review. When I had the six months off, half a sabbatical, then I would write a book. That's the way it worked out.

SMITH: I wanted to jump into some of the things that you've written. You've written eighty-something articles, and close to a dozen books. Obviously, we can't talk about everything, and the works stand for themselves, but what I'd like to do is explore how you came to select the problem, why it seemed important to you, and the degree to which you can reconstruct some of the steps that brought you to the solution. I may skip over things that are very important, so please, if you feel we

need to discuss an article that I haven't raised, you should just say, "Wait a minute, we'd better talk about this as well."

RIDGWAY: I am not the kind of person who really knows about which article is most valuable. In some cases I've even forgotten what I said, because some of them were written a long time ago, but I can tell you in general lines, the distinction. An article is usually an idea that comes while you are discussing something in class. Most of the times it really happens when you are telling the students something and then it sort of hits you and you say, "Wait a minute, I have always said this, but why am I saying it?" For instance, I was pointing to the Zeus of the Siphnian Treasury pediment, and I was saying, "This is Athena," which was the standard assumption. Of course, it didn't make any sense to say that it was Athena, and the moment I started looking at it closely I realized that it wasn't Athena. These are some of the things that come from teaching, and it's wonderful. When you have an idea like that, it jumps up and down inside you and you want to put it out. And that's usually what happens with articles. Again, as I told you, it wasn't any question of pressure at Bryn Mawr; those were not the days when you were pressured and encouraged to publish.

With the books it was a different thing. I wasn't even thinking of writing a book. I had given different seminars with the students, and one was on the severe style. It seemed to me that a lot of works that were in the severe style did not belong to the severe period; they were just imitating the severe style. I had given this

seminar, and I really believed this. Then Homer Thompson called me and said that they were having several people at the Institute [for Advanced Study] from other countries who were in sculpture, and they didn't have anybody from the United States, and he wanted me to apply. At that time I hadn't applied for a sabbatical because Machteld had told me I had to postpone it because she was excavating; she wasn't even there. So I went to the president and said, "What do I do? Homer Thompson asked me to apply to the Institute." Miss McBride said, "If Homer Thompson asked you to apply to the Institute, you apply to the Institute." Machteld said, "Well, you can only have one semester, because I am excavating during the first semester."

I had to present a proposal very fast, and the only thing that I had in mind was the seminar that I had just finished, so I gave the outline of the seminar, and then when I went over there I sat down and wrote what we had done during the seminar. This is why *The Severe Style in Greek Sculpture* took six months, because that's all the time there was. Homer Thompson never got over that because he thought it was so funny when I would say, "Oh yes, I will write this book in six months," and then I did it. Every now and then when he sees me, he says, "You are the person who wrote her first book in six months."

Until that time I hadn't really thought of writing a book, because I didn't think I could—the pressure of time, and so on, and the children were very young then.

Christopher was born in '64, and then he started having all these troubles when he was five months, and that went on for two years. So you can imagine, it was really very tight.

SMITH: In '64, you publish your article, "The Date of the So-Called Lysippean Jason" [*AJA* 68 (1964): 113–128]. I was wondering how you came to consider that problem, and the solution of changing the date.

RIDGWAY: Again, that was actually not even my seminar. This was Cambitoglou's seminar. You remember, I mentioned that when I returned from Greece he was the professor there, and because sculpture was not his forte he really wanted me to be present at his seminar. This statue was the topic of somebody's report. As usual, they presented the statue as one by Lysippos. The position of the statue led you to believe that it was three-dimensional, but when you saw it from the side, you practically lost track of what the pose of the statue was; it was quite obvious to me that it was enormously compressed. It was hardly of the time of Lysippos, who was famous for his three-dimensionality, according to our modern understanding of the situation. I thought the only other period where it would fit was when there was a revival of Lysippan interests, when you had these "trompe l'oeil" compositions. Recently, there has been a Bryn Mawr dissertation on the so-called one-sided or two-sided compositions. I am still working on this idea in my own various publications, because I am still convinced that my notion is completely valid, but

nobody has accepted it; as a matter of fact everybody disagrees, and that statue is still attributed to Lysippos.

I am completely convinced that this statue is one of these works that appealed greatly to the period of Roman illusionism, where you begin to have this breaking up of the wall with paintings that present vistas. It's the same idea as the Niobids; they look very three-dimensional, they're making all sorts of gestures, and then you look at them from the side and they are very flat. A lot of this might even have derived from two-dimensional arts: minor arts like metal engraving, or metal relief, and wall painting. I am more than ever convinced now that I will have to work more on this period, when all of a sudden a market opens up for sculpture that wasn't there before. The Romans want a lot of sculpture, and they want it for decoration or for inspirational purposes in their gardens, to recreate certain atmospheres. The Greeks, who were producing all these works, have to fall back on something.

Up to that point they had really done only votive or architectural religious art, and now they had to do something completely different, so they looked at all these works that had been more decorative, like vase painting and metal engraving, and they developed them into three dimensions, but they also liked this tricky aspect of it: they look three-dimensional, but then they can also be flat. It's not an inability to transform something two-dimensional into the third dimension; that they can do perfectly well. But they like to tease you, they like to create this sort of illusionism,

and I think that this is what happens with works like the Jason. So, even though it was one of my earliest ideas, I am developing it more and more now that I can put it in a better context. At the time I certainly didn't know. I think I am right, but, as I said, nobody has agreed with me to this day.

SMITH: Given the problems of context and all that, how would one resolve this argument? I guess it's not really an argument if no one's agreeing with you, but how would you be able to determine one way or another whether your hypothesis is right?

RIDGWAY: When I die I am going to ask Pheidias, I'm going to ask Lysippos, I'm going to ask all these people! I'm looking forward to it.

SMITH: But here in the sublunar world, what would one do?

RIDGWAY: I don't think you can resolve the argument. We know too little. On the other hand, it used to be my single voice, and now I think there are more voices saying something comparable. Nikolaus Himmelmann, for instance, has been working a lot on the Sperlonga sculptures, and he is saying they come from two-dimensional prototypes. I have been saying the same thing from a different angle. So I think we are getting there. There was one person who criticized one of my books, saying, "Oh, you are now taking everything away from the Classical period. You are making the period of Roman infiltration, the first or second century B.C., sound as if it was the most inventive period in Greek art." Indeed it was. I do believe now that that was the most inventive period. It was a very good period, because all of a sudden the

market opened up enormously and there was a great need for these things.

I stand by my theory, and I am used to criticism. Lots of my ideas have been considered off the wall. As a matter of fact, I was once introduced at a lecture as "a killer of white cows." [laughter] I finally even said, in one of the prefaces of my books, that I don't try to make waves for the sake of *épater les bourgeois*. I'm not trying to impress people, I'm not trying to be original and say something that startles. I am trying to call things the way I see them, and it doesn't mean that it is right. I have also always said, "Let's say that I am 85 percent wrong in what I suggest in my books. That means we are 15 percent ahead, because 15 percent must be right." It cannot be completely wrong, because I obviously don't say things without some kind of foundation, but it has taken forever for some of my ideas to be accepted.

Eventually, people have come around. There is a lot of emotionalism that goes on in archaeology. When you "attack," in quotes, a statue that has always been considered a certain way, people feel as if you had deprived them of a son or a daughter and they can't stand it. Also, there is this prejudice that anything that is late is not as good as something that is early. As a result, people try always to have the most important period for the work that they are discussing—I would call it defending, really. So when I say that something is late Hellenistic, eclectic, or Roman classicizing, or something of the sort, they don't like it.

I have to say what I think. On the other hand, I don't know that I am right.

Many of the suggestions that I make in my books are really suggestions. I am trying to present the problem. I'm not trying to replace one dogma with another dogma; otherwise the students would just take it down, write their notes, and forget to think. I want instead to present the difficulties with the accepted theories and say, "This is what I think for the moment, but I don't know. What do you think?" Which is the way Carpenter taught, and I think this is great. Should my students continue into teaching, I would hate to think of them saying, "Oh, this is the final word."

Eve Harrison once said to me, "If you work a little bit longer on this problem, you could solve it." I said to her, "I don't want to solve it, I want to show that there is a problem with what we have always said." I resent solutions that freeze the issue, because everybody says, "Oh, that is solved, so let's not touch it anymore." Instead, if you keep on thinking, who knows? All sorts of things are coming out. We are looking at sculpture in a very different way today.

SMITH: So was it considered "solved" that this statue of Jason was most likely by Lysippos?

RIDGWAY: Yes, but I don't think it could be by Lysippos, I think it's later. I think it's in Lysippan style, but I think it is doing something that is alien, let's say, to what I conceive of as what's happening with Lysippos. Again, I have to admit that we don't know Lysippan style that well. In my forthcoming book, [*Fourth Century Styles in Greek Sculpture*], I have a chapter on the various masters, and I keep doing the same

kind of things. I even do a case study on the Herakles Epitrapezios. There are two Roman epigrams that talk about a little bronze that was owned by a Roman who claimed that it was by Lysippos, so everybody has said, "Yes, typical Lysippos." I don't really think we know that it is by Lysippos. Those two Roman epigrams could just have been "flattery for the host" during Roman times. The conception of a Herakles who drinks and sits at the table and makes merry is a Roman conception of the hero as a big drinker and a big drunkard. In Greek times, the hero was a big eater, he wasn't a big drinker. So I am trying to say this doesn't fit with the Lysippan period, but it does fit with the Roman conception. Of course, nobody will believe it, but I am prepared, it doesn't matter. I argue my case as best I can. Whether it is true or not I don't know, but I have to call it as I see it.

SMITH: In preparing this article, you asked the German Archaeological Institute in Athens to make some photographs for you, and that got me wondering about your relationship with them at this time. Was this a personal relationship?

RIDGWAY: No, not at all. You go to the photographic cabinet and you ask for some photographs from their stock. Even recently, when I was doing the second edition of the *Archaic Style in Greek Sculpture*, I got some photographs from the German Archaeological Institute. Some of them were stamped, "Do Not Publish." Those of the Samian Kouros, the wonderful one, I couldn't publish. [Helmut] Kyrieleis, who is someone with whom I have had a lot of very pleasant contact, said,

"Absolutely not. Don't publish those photographs until I have published my work on the kouros." Has he published it yet? No (appeared later in 1997). I thought for sure he would have published his book long before mine came out. So I didn't publish the photographs at that time—what could I do? No, you don't have a special relationship there; you just get the photographs and you pay for them—anybody can get them.

SMITH: I also noticed that you cite Jacopi in this article. Did you continue to have some kind of relationship with him after you left Messina?

RIDGWAY: No, after I left the university, there was no relationship whatsoever, because, remember, the professor was way out there. Even though you went to the museum with him and you borrowed his books—Jacopi was very generous that way, because he had books that nobody else had—you didn't relate to him personally.

SMITH: As an Italian and a professor here in the Unites States, did you continue to develop relationships with Italian archaeologists?

RIDGWAY: Not particularly, no. My real contacts with foreign archaeologists started when I went to the American School in Athens, because that's like Piccadilly Circus, you meet everybody. But that was the only way.

LYONS: You didn't have a close relationship with Italian archaeologists, but they've done a lot of work on sculpture. How would you characterize their approach? Is it quite different from yours?

RIDGWAY: There is one thing that I learned from Rhys Carpenter, which I think has

really stayed with me. I used to write with a lot of words, the way Italians write with a lot of words, and Carpenter said that I should read the Gettysburg Address. [laughter] So I read the Gettysburg Address! But it came home to me that, indeed, when you try to translate something written by an Italian into concrete English terms, a lot of it is words, and then you stand back and say, "What did he say?" Even though the language and phraseology are wonderful and musical, it isn't very concrete. So I decided that when I was going to write something, there had to be a point, and it had to be clear and understood.

Carpenter also taught me something else. Never show a slide unless you have a point to make. This made a great impression on me, and this is what has allowed me always to lecture without notes. I arrange my slides so that I have two or three points to make per slide. The slides do the organization for me, so to speak. Obviously I have to put them in position, but then I can just talk to the slides. When I first gave my paper on the Jason, I was given ten minutes at the AIA. I was really worried so I wrote it down, and when I read it Machteld said to me, "Never read a paper again, because your accent comes out so strongly. You can talk, you don't have to follow a text." And that was very good advice. That comment, coupled with Rhys Carpenter's point on the slides, really allowed me to speak without notes. I didn't even want to keep notes, because if you start looking at notes you lose your place and you don't know where you are. I really trained myself to just talk to slides,

and I do that to this day.

LYONS: Then you would actually write the paper afterwards?

RIDGWAY: Afterwards. I would never try to write it before, because otherwise I would try to remember it. For the Sather Lectures I wrote the book, but then the lectures were completely different. First of all, I didn't even know what slides I was going to find at Berkeley. I couldn't take my slides from Bryn Mawr. So, you realize, it was very much on the spur of the moment. Then I found something wonderful. There were lots of buildings on the Berkeley campus that had classical motifs, so I started each lecture with a view of one of their buildings, and so people even came to me and said, "We might not have learned much about Greek architecture, but we certainly learned a lot about Berkeley. Now we look at things, you have opened our eyes." I was very pleased with that.

But to get back to your earlier question, in Athens I really made friends with a lot of the Italians, but it was through the Italian Institute of Culture. They had gone to the same universities as the people who were at the Italian School in Athens. For instance, I became very good friends with Nino [Antonino] Di Vita , who is now the director of the Italian School, because he had gone to the same university as Vincenzo Rotolo and the others who were with me at the Istituto Italiano di Cultura. Paola Pelagatti was the secretary at the Italian School. Clelia Laviosa was there, and Enrica Fiandra was the architect. Of course Doro Levi was the one who accepted me on the

excavation. He never forgot me. He saw me something like twenty years later, and he jumped up out of the chair and immediately said, "Miss Sismondo! Ah, how wonderful! I've been following your career. One child, one book!" Which at the time was true. But I was very pleased that he had this remembrance of me. He came to my lecture at the American School in Athens in '88, when he was very old.

LYONS; It seems as though there has been traditionally a Sicilian strength in Athens.

RIDGWAY: Yes, because many were coming from Palermo, where there was a very strong tradition of doing archaeology. Not only that, but Professor Bruno Lavagnini, who was the head of the Italian Institute of Culture, was a terrific Philhellene, especially strong in modern Greek. These were all people who had gone to the university together; including Nicola Bonacasa (head of the archaeological institute of Palermo University), who is still a good friend. So they were all coming from that tradition. You see, in Italy at that time there was no degree in archaeology. Your degree could only be in classical letters. There was this specialization school in Rome, but there was also the Italian School in Athens, so usually the Italians who had had an archaeological direction at their own institution would try to go to the school in Athens. You had to take a competitive exam, or something like that. Because of Lavagnini there was this other opening to Athens, and that's why there were a lot of people from Palermo. And Vincenzo Rotolo has become a very distinguished Hellenist (he has the chair in Neo-Greek at Palermo University). He married a Greek.

I saw him in Palermo quite recently as a matter of fact, one or two years ago. He continues to publish enormously.

SMITH: The next article I wanted to ask you about was "Notes on the Development of the Greek Frieze" [*Hesperia* 35 (1966):188–204], which was published in *Hesperia*, in honor of W. B. Dinsmoor. Was that a commissioned article?

RIDGWAY: No. That was a very funny thing. I told you that I had been interested in the distribution of architectural sculpture, and I had given that topic to Nancy Bookidis for her dissertation. Obviously, I had been working with it myself all along. I gave a lecture on it at Columbia University, and Eve Harrison actually liked it very much. She mentioned it to Lucy Shoe [Meritt], who called me and said that somebody who was supposed to produce an article for the Dinsmoor festschrift didn't, so they needed one more article. She said, "After all, you studied with Dinsmoor on the Akropolis, and you were the *Guide Bleu.*" When I was at the summer school, as his assistant, I was wearing a blue dress, so everybody started calling me the *Guide Bleu*. So she said it would be appropriate if I did this for Dinsmoor. I was delighted, and honored, because at that time I really was a nobody, and I did have the greatest admiration for Dinsmoor. So that's how that happened. But it was a lecture, and I had to sit down and write it in a hurry, because, as usual, the lecture was not written.

SMITH: What were you trying to change about the way other archaeologists were

thinking and working in that article?

RIDGWAY: I wasn't trying to change anything. I was just trying to look at things. I wasn't really setting out to have a new direction. This is I think what has been misunderstood to some extent, because people really thought of me as trying to be original. I wasn't trying to be original. I was just saying, "This doesn't make sense." Carpenter had started me on this. He really was a questioning person. There is a book that he has written, *Observations on Familiar Statuary in Rome*, where he goes through all sorts of various pieces in Rome and tells you what people usually think, but he can't believe that that is correct. I thought that was wonderful, I love that style. I also loved Humfry Payne, and the book that he wrote on the Akropolis korai. So, if you say, "Which model did you have?" I would say these two books were really very influential for me. I never met Humfry Payne. He died very young.

SMITH: Were you continuing to see Carpenter on a regular basis?

RIDGWAY: Not regularly, no. As a matter of fact, it took quite a while before I had the nerve to go and visit him socially. Actually, when he became elderly and he wasn't moving around so much, people encouraged me, saying, "He is lonesome, go and see him and tell him what you are doing." I still had the man on a pedestal, so it was kind of difficult for me to do that. But I did take Carlos Picón to see him, because that boy loved sculpture so much. He is now the curator of ancient art at the Metropolitan Museum. He really took to sculpture. I had the same kind of feeling

for sculpture; Carpenter really lit the fire for me. So I wanted Carlos to meet Carpenter—to see my "source." Carpenter chuckled about that and said, "Is this the passing of the torch?" I said, "Yes, in a way." Then of course when he was in a nursing home I went to see him more out of a sense of duty than because we had a friendship. Obviously, I adored the man, but it wasn't the kind of relationship where I felt that I was close to him; he was too far up for me.

SMITH: You've talked about how *The Severe Style* came to be written and why it was written in six months. There were a couple of questions that I had about some of the statements that you made in there. You cite Rhys Carpenter's statement in his book *Greek Sculpture*: "The severe style was an abrupt but inevitable and predictable change." Is that a conclusion that a formal stylistic analysis would lead one to? Is that a conclusion that follows a methodology?

RIDGWAY: Well, I myself have written on that. There was the symposium in honor of Cedric [C. G.] Boulter, and I was asked to talk about the transition from late archaic to severe, and Eve Harrison was asked to talk about severe. There was such a fervor of activity in architectural sculpture in the transition period. There was so much being done. You need a big project for style to change. The Greeks really were not changing in drastic ways; they were changing in small proportions. You could see that a temple begins having a certain shape of capital on the one side and by the time you get to the back side the shape of the capital has even changed slightly;

you refine it, you improve on it, and so on. I think this is what happens with sculpture. As long as you don't have too many commissions you don't change that much, but the moment you start having a big commission, such as the Temple of Aphaia at Aegina, which ended by having three pedimental compositions, then you really begin to move a lot, and things develop. And I see that as really the epitome of the transition from the archaic to the severe.

There is a movement toward naturalism, but the more naturalistic you become the more fussy you become, and therefore you can only break through on that by saying, "Okay, I'm going to be very simple." So, in a way, yes, it was inevitable, but I think it happened because of the increase in commissions, the use of bronze, and the concomitant use of clay. I still do think that clay had a role to play in the development of the severe style. That too has been criticized. I don't know that it is true, but that's what I think.

SMITH: But again, what would we need to be able to determine the role of clay?

RIDGWAY: Because it looks like it; it looks doughy. People tease me for using culinary terms; I talk about "chocolate squares hair," "vermicelli drapery," "doughy costumes," or "cookie-cutter technique" because I visualize these things. But it conveys an image. So okay, I'm a housewife too at the same time, so why not? [laughter] It seems to me that that drapery really conveys the impression of a sheet of clay, and you cannot do a bronze statue without clay. In those days there was still the

thought that maybe you would have a wood prototype. This idea has been abandoned completely now.

There was also the very valid theory concerning the use of wax. Wax is so hard that you can really cut it with a knife, and therefore you end up with the same result as if you were carving with your chisel. So it isn't necessarily the use of the more malleable materials such as wax that will give you that effect. But if you are modeling with clay, which you do to create the core of a bronze statue if nothing else, or to create the model, you will eventually have this sense of something that can be rolled and done in sheets, so this has to give you some kind of idea. I'm sure that the Olympia sculptures had to have models, because you can't heft up these enormous pieces of marble and then put them up on a pediment and find that they don't fit. You have to have some kind of idea where they are going to go, therefore you have to have models, and if you make models you're not going to make them of stone, you're going to make them of clay.

So I think that inevitably this feeds into the style. But again, it is not believed, because people have pointed out that there are some contemporary terra-cotta statues that look exactly as if they were carved in stone. I still see the effect of clay, even in the clay, but some of the trouble with style is that what one person sees is not necessarily what another person sees. So you can tell them that this is how you see it, but that doesn't mean that they are going to agree with you.

SMITH: There have been ways proposed for addressing visual phenomena in what proponents hope would be less subjective ways.

RIDGWAY: Yes, yes, as a matter of fact when I was at the Institute [for Advanced Study, Princeton] writing *The Severe Style* I had to give a talk on it. You are always asked to give a talk on your research. Werner Fuchs was working on sculpture there, and he was the reason why Homer Thompson wanted me to be there. So Werner Fuchs got up and made a big speech saying, "What about the ethos of the time, what about the spirit, what about the new conception?" I said, "But I cannot point to it. I really want to show what I can point to." Of course this is also the housewife approach, you know; this is the kind of thing Carl Nylander and I argued about. I think now, in my more recent books, I take things like "ethos" into account a little bit more. But I always want to start from the concrete, from something that I can really see and point to and describe. Then maybe I can speculate on the ethos, but the point is, we don't really know. We can't think the way the Greeks did, we really can't; we are part of a completely different culture. We can try to figure out what was going on, but we have no way of *knowing*.

I know that sometimes I am misunderstood because I still come from an Italian, not an American tradition. This is a stupid example, but it still rankles me: I told you that we were talking to this psychologist for Kevin; I said to her that I had breast-fed all four of my children. Now, I am proud of that, and not only that, but I

also was trying to tell her that these children had a lot of contact with me in the early months of their life. Well, she came back to me a couple of days later, saying, "You play the victim." I said, "Why do I play the victim?" She said, "You mentioned immediately that you had breast-fed the children." In thinking about what I said, she came to the conclusion that I mentioned it because it was an imposition, that I was a noble woman who sacrificed. But in fact I was showing a feather in my cap! So there is an example of complete misunderstanding between two contemporary cultures. Just imagine if we really tried to understand what the Greeks were doing.

SMITH: But we do have examples of the ethos in the literature, don't we?

RIDGWAY: The literature is rarefied. Even if you take Aristophanes' comedies, they are extreme because they are trying to get a laugh out of you, so they don't reflect the tradition. The rest of the literature is also written with a bias; for instance, the tragedies do not reflect the climate of daily life. This is why I get so mad when people say women were so depressed in Greek times. I am not a feminist, but I grew up in a family where, although my father was the figure of authority, he never moved a finger without my mother saying something. My mother was the power behind the throne. She was a very forceful woman, even though on the surface she always deferred to my father.

When people say women had no position in Greece, they had to stay in the home, and so on, I think that is an American conception, because women did not have

the vote. In Italy, women did not have the vote, but they went to the university long before American women were allowed to have a Ph.D. The Mediterranean woman seems to be much more subject to the husband, and probably she is in legal terms, but not in terms of influence. I'm sure that that was true in antiquity. I think that there is this cultural misunderstanding that is reflected in the literature, because when you read the literature, of course you read about the trials against women, but if you read the accounts of trials today that is not going to give you an idea of American life as it really is. Those are special cases. When you read the history, it's about the men and the kings; it's not talking about the women. Women had enormous roles to play in rituals, in religion; that's why they were priestesses. And there are of course anthropological studies that point out the important role of women in funerals, and in the running of the house. To say that the women were not in contact with the men is not true at all, either.

So there is, I think, a misconception, because we read according to our own minds. We also read according to our own historical period. One of the things that was to me most illuminating was one of [Ernst] Badian's comments when he talked about how the legend of Alexander the Great could have such terrific hold on scholars' minds because people were used to thinking in terms of a Napoleon, in terms even of the *Führer* and Mussolini. There were these conceptions of a single man who leads a nation to conquest, and therefore of course you could see Alexander the Great

as doing all of this. And yet, if you look at the legend of Alexander the Great from a more critical point of view, then you see that there were as many people critical of Alexander as there were in favor of him. The Macedonians disliked him because he had taken them away from home and lots of them had died. They couldn't really see the advantage of all those campaigns. But we believe in the legend of Alexander because it came at a time when we thought that it was quite possible. I thought that Badian's comment was very illuminating that way. We read history, even ancient history, according to what we go through in our own day.

SMITH: In *The Severe Style*, what were the key criteria that you were working with for the selection of the monuments that you discuss? You say in the preface that you can't attempt to be complete, and you are writing for the student rather than for the scholar.

RIDGWAY: Well, I chose those monuments about which I felt I had something to say. There isn't really that much in the severe style; it's a very short period of thirty years. I didn't think I should include the terracottas, because [Vagn] Poulsen had done a major study of those. And they were made with molds, and so they automatically reproduced the same type over and over again. I certainly think that I hit all the major monuments, because it's a short period.

SMITH: At the very end of the book you have a defense of the subjective method, which you've actually been giving us for the last fifteen minutes, and you say,

"*Subjective* is not always the equivalent of *erroneous*, and style is objective enough, even if elusive at times. It is only on the strength of this conviction that the study of ancient sculpture is at all possible." I was wondering who you were thinking about when you were making that kind of argument. Who in the archaeological field needed to be convinced of the subjective basis of knowledge and judgment?

RIDGWAY: I suppose probably the American School in Athens, in a way, because they absolutely did not want to have anything to do with sculpture.

[Tape III, Side Two]

RIDGWAY: Jerry [J. J.] Pollitt gets very upset when I speak about the "attribution game," but it is somewhat of a game, or a gamble. People would attribute the same piece of sculpture to five or six different people, and we didn't know those five people; we didn't really know what their style was like. It is useless to try and match lists in Pliny that are not descriptive with objects that we have, but this is what people were trying to do. They were going through their museum saying, "Which is the one that might fit this particular title by Pliny?" That is not the way to do sculpture, and because of this, I think sculpture has a bad reputation. People look at it and say, "How can this work be attributed to five different people?" It has to belong to just one. As a result, there are very few people who study sculpture. Many of my students have always said, "I don't want to study sculpture, it's too difficult." With architecture you feel that it's more objective. Vase painting is more objective because

you have many more of them and therefore you can see the "handwriting."

Basically, all of these things involve stylistic judgments; even when you look at architecture it is a matter of style in the long run. You say, "Yes, but I can measure it." But you cannot measure what happened, or why a particular change was made. I gave a lecture in honor of Father [Edward W.] Bodner, at Georgetown University and also at the AIA, "In Defense of Sculptural Style." I was pointing out that every other study that is considered legitimate archaeology is ultimately based on stylistic judgment. Even when you do letter forms, that's still a stylistic assessment. Yet stylistic evaluation is the reason why sculpture has a bad reputation, and this is why I felt that I had to defend it. And it still needs defending, you know.

LYONS: There are also students, like me, who just don't have the training in purely art-historical visual analysis, and sculpture demands that ability much more than any of the other areas of study.

RIDGWAY: I was thinking yesterday about your question about the theoretical basis of my analysis. I didn't have any theoretical basis. I only had a great deal of looking. It isn't that somebody said to me, "Look for this." They just said,"Look." And I looked. After a while you do develop an eye. You look at certain things, the Parthenon, for instance, and then, for other sculptures you can say, "Well, this is not the Parthenon style," or, "Within the Parthenon I can see this style developing."

SMITH: An important part of current theory, which actually goes back to Kant, is

that you can't see anything unless you've already got the category that you are looking for.

RIDGWAY: No. Let me tell you about this. We had a big fight at CASVA. I was at the Center for Advanced Study in the Visual Arts (September–December, 1986), and the dean is Henry Millon, a specialist on Michelangelo. I was trying to write my Hellenistic book [*Hellenistic Sculpture 1: The Styles of ca. 331–200 B.C.*], and I had to give a talk. I was trying to say that I was looking for monuments that fell within my span of time so that then I could extrapolate what the styles of the third century were. Hank Millon kept saying, "You must know already what the style is, otherwise how can you do that?" I was saying, "No, I don't know what the style was, because I don't even know the date of the monuments. I first want to figure out what monuments belong to this period, and then I can tell you what the style is, but otherwise I can't." He didn't understand it at all. We went on and on and on with this. We had one of our Tuesday lunches. He brought it up again, he couldn't see it.

Finally, there was an Englishman (Lawrence Gowing), who was the visiting Kress Professor, and he stood up and said, "I understand her point of view completely. You are the one who doesn't understand it." We are not in possession of a body of material that is as carefully documented as the Renaissance, or the baroque period, or any of the other periods, where you already know what people are doing. Here I have to decide whether something is really third century or whether it is

something made much later, or if it is a Roman copy. So, until I know what is in that period, I cannot tell you what the styles of the period are. But, oh boy, I don't know that Hank Millon to this day has seen my point of view. I gave him a copy of my book, but I don't think he has read it.

Also, we are talking about an enormous geographical area, and a large span of time, so you cannot say, "This is the style." There was a time when this was done. You know there is this famous article by Gerhard Krahmer that is so influential, on the phases of Hellenistic style, and I read that. Carpenter wrote a very influential review of Miss Bieber's Hellenistic book, where he was really going through the phases in sequence, and this is why we had the seminar on the Hellenistic period. For a while, I was really following Carpenter's lead, but then the more I worked on my own, the more convinced I became that there were styles that coexisted in certain periods, and therefore you could not say, "This is the style of the fifth century." This is why my fifth-century book is called *Fifth-Century Styles* [*in Greek Sculpture*]. But the severe style is so much more limited in time that you could say, "Yes, this is the severe style." When you find it in the first century B.C. you can still say it's trying to imitate the severe, even though it's "severizing" by that time.

SMITH: Why was your article in 1971, "The Setting of Greek Sculpture," important for you?

RIDGWAY: It wasn't. As a matter of fact, that again was a lecture that people

asked me to write up because they had liked it. Very often things start as lectures and then people say, "Why don't you write it?" I have changed my mind in some of those things. Some of those manifestations that I thought were really Greek, I now would be convinced are Roman. I wrote an article on gardens, which was commissioned by Dumbarton Oaks ["Greek Antecedents of Garden Sculpture"], where I took back some of the things that I said in "The Setting of Greek Sculpture." On the other hand, of course, some of the things that I say there are still valid.

I think it's important to look at the way sculpture was displayed. When I look at Hellenistic sculpture, I ask myself to determine where it would have been displayed, because the Romans displayed sculpture in a completely different way from the Greeks. Something that the Romans liked very much and that they put all over their gardens might not have had a place at all in a Greek sanctuary, because it wasn't appropriate. Even when they had a sense of landscape, as with the Nike of Samothrace, it seems that that wasn't a fountain after all, but a Roman rearrangement. The comparable monument in Cyrene is sitting in the middle of the Agora, and yet it is supposed to be a ship coming through. They did not have this sense of "landscape with sculpture" that I thought they had, so the second part of my article I don't think is valid anymore; I think it's beginning in the Greek (Hellenistic) period, but I think it's partly beginning through Roman influence.

SMITH: Was the literature on the distinction between the Greek and Roman use of

sculpture changing in the period of the seventies and eighties, which then led you to rethink your position, or was there new evidence that was appearing?

RIDGWAY: No, no. Again, it's my teaching. As I teach, these questions arise. Sometimes it might even be a freshman who asks you the question, because the freshman doesn't know enough, and therefore she feels completely free to ask a really liberating question, whereas those who know more say, "Oh, but so-and-so says this, and so-and-so says that." The freshman who hasn't read anything says, "Why would they put it there?" And then you say, "Yes, why?" Then you start thinking. I was never in contact very much with other people who were working in sculpture; I never had real theoretical debates with colleagues. No, unfortunately I have to say that I'm very self-made. The greatest impact really was Carpenter, and after that I was really on my own.

SMITH: But you did have debates with Evelyn Harrison.

RIDGWAY: Yes, but you see, Eve Harrison and I don't see things the same way at all. I find it very difficult to argue with her. Maybe I respect the woman too much, so when she says something that contradicts my thinking, it is devastating to me, and I cannot argue with her. She always tells me what to think, and that's why I don't discuss things with her. I quote her extensively because I find her work very valuable, but she practically never quotes me in her articles or in her books. We cannot really talk together, and we are not aiming for the same things either.

SMITH: She places a lot of importance on epigraphy and epigrammatic evidence.

RIDGWAY: Yes, she knows a lot more than I do, and she knows a lot more about history. She tends to solve problems, so to speak; she wants to arrive at a final solution, whereas I don't want to do that particularly.

SMITH: Do you think she does arrive at final solutions?

RIDGWAY: Unfortunately, many of her solutions I don't agree with. She based her idea on the appearance of the Nike on the hand of the Athena Parthenos on the slanted neckline of a Roman head in the [Athenian] Agora. I can think of a variety of other reasons why you have a slanted neckline without being a Nike. I think that the experiment in Nashville was very illuminating, because you obviously cannot see the top of the head of the Nike; you cannot even see the Nike that clearly when you have the statue at full size, and therefore I cannot imagine that anybody was reproducing that head's hairstyle at that moment (second century after Christ) as an intentional quotation of the Parthenos' Nike.

So from this point of view, the argument is invalidated, but I'm not going to argue with her because she has a lot of other observations that are wonderful. Usually she has wonderful ideas in her articles, but then she pushes them much further. In her article on the statues for the Hephaisteion, I can't believe the group as she reconstructs it. But the comments that she has on the Athena Velletri are wonderful. What I can take from Eve Harrison are her observations of style, because

she is tremendous there. It's when she reconstructs too many things that I cannot follow her anymore, and I don't agree with her reconstructions.

The Athena Parthenos is another case in point. When I was asked whether I would help the young sculptor who was reconstructing the Athena in Nashville, I said to him, "Oh, you must talk to Neda Leipen, you must talk to Eve Harrison." He said, "Well, I tried, but they don't want to get involved." Then, years later, when the sculptor was working on the statue and I was involved, I said to Eve Harrison, "Why won't you help him?" And she said, "Oh, I am so afraid that it's going to be ugly." She just didn't want to have anything to do with it. When I was in Athens in '88 I gave a talk on the Nashville Athena and what had been done up to that point, and then Eve became very enthusiastic and she did give the sculptor some concrete help in the reconstruction of the shield. But up to that moment she had not wanted to have anything to do with it because she was too worried.

When I was approached for advice I knew they had to do it anyhow because they were bound by law. You see, they had requested donations specifically for a statue of the Athena Parthenos. They had collected $36,000, and they felt that they couldn't do anything else. They called me and I said, "Oh, come on. You cannot reproduce the gold and ivory Athena by Pheidias. Who knows what it really looked like? Use the money for scholarships." And they said, "We can't, legally. We really have to make a statue." So I told them I would help as much as I could, because at

least if nothing else I could tell the young sculptor where to look, or if what he's doing looks proper for the time or not. I was the only one really willing to stick my neck out, because that is what it amounted to. My neck has been chopped off so many times that I don't care. [laughter] You see, I wasn't trying to establish myself as an authority. I write because if I have an idea inside I want to get it out; it's bubbling and I want to share it. Whether people believe it or not is beside the point.

SMITH: Well, how accurate can that reproduction be? How much can it convey of what was in the Parthenon in the fifth century?

RIDGWAY: First of all, you have cella that is exactly the size of the cella of the Parthenon, which is something you cannot even get from the Parthenon itself, because by now the interior is all empty. You have the interior colonnade that has the same dimensions. Dinsmoor (Sr.) was the advisor for that building in Nashville, and I find it wonderful that I studied with him, and I have now contributed to the reproduction of that statue. The Nashville statue has exactly the same dimensions as the statue in the Parthenon. It might look completely different, but it has the right dimensions, so you have an idea of what a colossus of that size really looked like in a building of that size, and you also see the figure of the Nike.

I want to show you a photograph of me and the Nike . . . where is that? There is a picture of me standing right next to the Nike. [showing photos] Here, in this older photo, we were all squatting on the floor because we had to see the Athena

from below. Ah, here it is, okay. Look at the size of that Nike, and look at it on the hand of the statue, there. You can say anything else you want, but I am life size, and that Nike is well over life size. You put it on the hand of the statue and it looks like a little bird. Unless you do things like this, unless you see it visually, you pay attention to the head of the Nike and the hairstyle, because you think you can see it, but you are not going to be able to see it once it is in place. This is even taken with a zoom lens. This is why the experiment is valid, you see.

Also, the sculptor proved to my satisfaction, quite conclusively, that he could cantilever the arm of Athena and put a Nike on the arm without having to have a column. There's a big debate: should you have a column under the right arm of Athena or not? The marble replicas need a column because the marble will break. The original statue was gold and ivory with an armature, but they knew the cantilever principle, because you have it all over the Parthenon and all over the Propylaia. To put a column against the background of the Parthenon inner columns would have looked terrible, because the column with the statue would have been a different size and a different form. So the sculptor said he was not going to put a column there. I said, "Good for you. I wouldn't have put a column either, but I didn't want to influence you one way or another." I am more than ever convinced that there was no column in the original. Two years ago, in the Agora, they found a terra-cotta from a lamp or something, with the Athena Parthenos, and she had no column; it's in a

fourth-century context, which means that it's really very close to the date of the original. But seeing the statue in the interior of the Parthenon made me realize how the column would have conflicted.

When you look at the decoration of the sandals at small scale, you wonder how there could have been a centauromachy on the sandals. Then you look at the sandals of the statue when it is full scale. Hold on. I'll show you the sandals. They are somewhere in here . . . I am not very systematic. Here [showing photo]. You see how high the soles of those sandals are? They are really at eye-level with you, so you realize why they were decorated. But whenever you see the reduced Roman copies, you have no sense of that.

SMITH: Now, why the image of the centaurs?

RIDGWAY: Well, that has a special meaning for the Greeks, and it's also in the metopes, so the statue is picking up all the themes from the other decoration, and there is a whole system, let's say, of subjects.

SMITH: But is putting in this particular image a speculative deduction?

RIDGWAY: (We know the centauromachy was there because of ancient descriptions in the literature.) It's in the sandals, at the lowest order of levels, just above the base, which was the appropriate level for monsters. Also, it does connect with the metopes. You are still commemorating the victory over the Persians, to some extent, but you cannot commemorate it directly (without being accused of *hubris*), so you

have to commemorate it allegorically in such a way that it will always make sense (as a story in itself, through the centuries). Also, there was something else that I realized. This picture was taken at the inauguration in Nashville. When they opened the doors, even though we were way out, this statue was so enormous that it looked as if it were just out in between the columns. It was incredible. I therefore came to the conclusion that it wasn't the artistry of Pheidias, and it wasn't really the style of the figure that made it so impressive. It was the awe of the image— the gold and ivory, the size—that created a masterpiece, not Pheidias. I think that's our misconception, because we want to see the hand of the man who really could sculpt the Gods.

So, you learn from things like this. I have been giving this lecture an awful lot, because I think that people need to hear about the statue in Nashville. I tried to get the *National Geographic* to go and see it, and they didn't want to do it. It's too bad, because it's a major contribution, I think. So that was another example, you see, of the traditional archaeologist being afraid of getting involved in something like this. Because, how can anyone do it, in fact? You can't. This is not Pheidias' Athena, but it is something of the same size, in the same room, in the same kind of space, and we learn from it. So I am willing; I try everything. Why not? It still gives me some kind of insight.

SMITH: What about your article from '74, "A Story of Five Amazons" [*AJA* 78 (1974): 1–17]?

RIDGWAY: Oh, you were taping all along? Oh, no, I was just showing those photographs.

SMITH: That's fine. It was quite interesting and useful. It's a documentation of your mind working out a problem.

RIDGWAY: What a horrible, messy place.

SMITH: No, that's all right. Maybe we should all be able to deal with the fact that minds are messy, and not everything comes fully formed like Athena out of Zeus, you know.

RIDGWAY: Well, you wanted to know about "A Story of Five Amazons." That's another theory that nobody has believed at all. At that time I was becoming more and more convinced that there were some statues that were considered Greek, and they couldn't have been. It started in a very funny way. When I was just looking at the heads of those Amazon types (there are four accepted types in the literature, and a fifth that is more questionable), I really couldn't tell them apart. The only one that I could tell apart from the others was the Mattei Amazon; that has a different face. Then I had to write up one of these Amazons, (the Lansdowne/New York type) for the Rhode Island School of Design museum, for the catalog, and I really ended up by counting all the strands of her hair. It was really a question of how many strands there were, and I thought, "My word. Can you really have these kinds of differentiations? Is this really what the style of a sculptor is all about? How many

ways of rolling up the curls?"

Then it really hit me that the Lansdowne/New York statue was leaning against a pillar, but the original was bronze. There was no question that the statue was leaning against a pillar, because not only was it reproduced in all the replicas, but it was even in a relief that obviously didn't need it, structurally. I began to have real qualms. I started looking at the drapery and it looked to me as if it really had those archaic patterns that you get in Asia Minor, and I could find a lot of examples of those on the skirts of Roman soldiers. I started looking at the anecdote of Pliny and I didn't believe it, because it really doesn't make sense. The moment I started looking at all this kind of evidence, it really fell apart.

First I lectured about it, as usual. I gave a paper at an international meeting in Turkey, where nobody believed a word of it. Then a student in Archaeology 101 went to New York (to see a replica of the Amazon) and did a paper on this type. Here was this girl, with absolutely no training—as a matter of fact she was a math major—who came up with some of the same points I did, and she couldn't have known about my lecture because it wasn't written out; I had just lectured abroad. But she asked the same questions. She was surprised that it was leaning against a pillar; that, for a bronze, was surprising. Also, the statue was raising her arm on the side where she had the wound, and that kind of thing. I thought, "Boy, if an untrained person in a freshman course can see it, there must be something to it." So I

wrote it up.

After a while, some recognition started coming in. A person who had studied the Ephesos altar said that the relief probably also belongs to the Roman period, and if indeed that relief belongs to the Roman period, then history would support the date, because Augustus was very supportive of the sanctuary. I don't doubt that there were statues at Ephesos that gave rise to the anecdote, but I think they were added at different periods. But to this day the Germans and everybody else publishes on those Amazons and they are still attributing them to Polykleitos, to Kresilas, to Pheidias, absolutely; my idea is the crackpot idea. But that's how it started, and I still see those difficulties; I don't see that I should change my mind on that.

SMITH: Well, there are two methodological or epistemological aspects to this: one is the inability of the Polykleitan thesis to hold, let's say, and you may have demonstrated that, but do you need to have an alternative dating?

RIDGWAY: Well, my alternative of course was based on the fact that you don't really have statues leaning on pillars in bronze until much later. Now that evidence has actually come apart, because I was using the so-called Agon from the Mahdia shipwreck, and now they've found out that it does not belong, that it doesn't go together with the herm on which he was made to lean. But this idea of having a bronze with a support really is more of an iconographic message rather than a need of the bronze. A bronze should not lean on anything, a bronze can stand on a toe. So I

still would say that the supports appear in a period in which they were trying to do surprising things—the opposite from what you would expect. Also, at that point it really would fit in with the history of the sanctuary. When do you have a renewal of interest in the sanctuary? At the time of the right of asylum, when all these laws were challenged. I tried to find a period in which it fit.

One thing that I couldn't reconcile was the fact that if these sculptors really were more or less working contemporaneously, first of all, why would they all have a wounded Amazon? If they are really commemorating the city's founders, why would Ephesos commission defeated Amazons, and why would they look so alike? There is an Amazon in the Villa Doria Pamphili, and that one I think everybody has accepted as classicizing; it has dropped out of the debate, nobody says anything on that. I was the one who pointed out that the hairstyle was completely classicizing, but nobody picked that point up. To this day I don't know if I am right. As a matter of fact, if you read the latest work on Polykleitos, the Amazon is very much in there.

SMITH: But you are convinced that the New York type can't be Polykleitan.

RIDGWAY: Well, I don't know that it can't be Polykleitan, but I don't think it is fifth century. Also, there is some suggestion that maybe it is the Capitoline type of Amazon that is Polykleitan; people don't agree which is which. I think the Mattei cannot be fifth century because there is an enormous amount of torsion in that composition. I have to call it as I see it. But whether I convince others or not doesn't

matter, in a way.

SMITH: Where do you see this argument going over the next several generations? I guess I am asking you where you see sculptural archaeology going.

RIDGWAY: First of all, I think we are beginning to take much more into account the fact that Roman copies are not as faithful as we thought they were, so we will be a little bit freer in evaluating these works. As a matter of fact, John [H.] Humphrey has sent me Mark Fullerton's review [*Journal of Roman Archaeology* 10 (1997): 427–40] of two books that deal with this. One is Michaela Fuchs's catalog of the so-called "ideal" sculpture in Roman art, and the other one is Lori-Ann Touchette's book on the dancing maenads. John wants to know what I think of this review. Of course I haven't been able to read it because I got it yesterday. I think Mark Fullerton is doing wonderful work. He is a great mind, and in a way I would have wanted him as my successor at Bryn Mawr, but Bryn Mawr obviously didn't want to have my input on that issue.

I think that there will be more open-mindedness in the approach to copies, and with that will come a better evaluation of what is Greek and what is Roman. Now, probably without additional evidence, I don't know that we can solve the problem of the Amazons, but additional evidence in excavation can always come. It might even be that it is a fourth-century relief that shows that I am wrong, that the New York Amazon type really existed in the fifth century, in which case, obviously the theory is

invalid. But we need new evidence. We don't have enough now. All we are going to get is more open-mindedness. But I think excavation can provide all sorts of possibilities.

SMITH: Was the conception that Roman copies were faithful based on evidence, or was that an assumption?

RIDGWAY: In some cases it was based on evidence, because certainly some of them were so close, within a few centimeters of each other; they obviously reproduced the prototype so faithfully that you had to say they were copies. But also there was the famous *Kopienkritik*, which has now been brought up again and examined by a lot of other authors, who have pointed out that the method was to put together all these various replicas of a certain work of art and then determine what was the closest to your conception of the period when the work was made. So, in a way, it was still very subjective to say, "This is more faithful than this one" simply because you thought this was the way the Greeks would have done it.

I think what has really changed is that we were looking at all these things in order to capture what was Greek, and now we are looking at them in order to capture also what was Roman. Margarete Bieber had already done that in her book on Roman copies, but it was from the vantage point of saying that when you see a mistake you can tell that it is the fault of the Roman copy because the sculptor didn't understand the dress, or the arrangement of the costume, whereas the Greek would

have known and therefore would have done something else. She was still looking at them as faulty representations; she was trying to find the incongruities that were due to the inability of the Roman master to understand what the Greek was trying to do. So she was still trying to recapture the Greek, whereas I am trying to understand the Roman conception.

Now that we have the Baiae casts, for instance, we can visualize how the Romans might have used Greek sculptures to create something that satisfied the tastes of their own time, rather than copying what the Greeks were doing. There is also the question of location—where the Romans wanted to put the sculpture, and how that differed from where the Greeks had put it. I don't think that you were allowed to copy statues in sanctuaries, so you would never have an exact copy from a place like that.

I don't think that the Romans were interested in the "style of masters" per se; I think they were interested in things that had meaning for them. This is what I tried to say in *Roman Copies* [*of Greek Sculpture: The Problem of the Originals*], which, again, was not received with any great enthusiasm. As a matter of fact, I think the people at the American Academy in Rome, where I gave the Jerome Lectures in 1982, were a little bit embarrassed by it. When it came out, they printed very few copies, so it went out of print. Then, people would write to me from abroad saying, "We are trying to get your *Roman Copies* and we can't get it." I finally wrote to the

press, and they had to reprint it; and now they are at the third reprinting. They can't get over the fact that people are buying the book.

Olga Palagia was recently in Chicago, and she was talking to Gloria Pinney about Roman copies, and Gloria said, "But Bruni said this long ago." Olga said, "Oh, yes, but Bruni went too far, so she couldn't be believed." I don't think I went too far; it's just that I was too early, and I have an impression that Carpenter also very often had the same problem of being too early. He would say things that people were not ready to accept, but then eventually they would come around. People were not ready to accept his ideas, and then afterwards they turned out to be correct. So I am afraid that that was the problem; that idea was too early. The Germans had already done work in that direction, but if it is German it sounds more authoritative. [laughter] But now people are beginning to be much more open-minded.

SMITH: But while you were writing *Roman Copies*, wasn't Gloria Pinney at Bryn Mawr?

RIDGWAY: I wasn't at Bryn Mawr then. I was at Michigan and then at the American Academy in Rome. I gave the lectures as usual without writing them up, and then I had to write the book.

SMITH: But you weren't working on this in course material at Bryn Mawr beforehand?

RIDGWAY: No, because I was really asked to do something for the Jerome

Lectures, which I mentioned, and they are for a Roman topic. I really had to scramble to find something that I could do that I felt was valid for Roman, and that's why I did that; it was not something that I tried at Bryn Mawr, no.

SMITH: Had this been an issue that had been bothering you for some time, the question of Roman copies?

RIDGWAY: Oh yes, because "The Story of Five Amazons" was already hitting that. It's not so much the Roman issue; it is the idea of trying to determine what is really Greek, because if something is Lysippan, or if it is first century, there is a great discrepancy, you see, and that has always bothered me. Or severizing—you see the same thing in the severe style. If something is bringing back the style, but it's not the period, I want to know, because if I look at that work and I try to get a conception of the severe style by looking at something that is much later, then I am missing out on what the severe style really is. So I think I have always had the sense that I ought to know where the piece belongs, and that inevitably takes you to the Roman period.

SMITH: I wanted to ask you about your position on the debate over the Riace bronzes: how you arrived at your position, and why it became so controversial.

RIDGWAY: I can only repeat what I have already said many times. I saw the Riace bronzes when they were just out of the water; they were still all encrusted and they were lying down. Looking at them lying down, all I could really see of them were the feet, and the feet were nearly identical; they were really very close. I thought these

statues belonged together because you could tell that they were set up the same way—the feet worked the same way, and so on. Then they cleaned them up, and everybody started saying, "Fifth century . . . Pheidias." The statues looked very contradictory to me, and yet I was convinced that they went together. You know, there are some theories that would place them as many as thirty years apart. To me that is a sign that they are eclectic, because you cannot have that discrepancy in time and yet have two statues that as far as I can tell were made to meet the same specifications. They are in the same pose, they stand the same way, and they both have shields.

There are all these aspects that surprise: the rendering of the hair, the rendering of the mouth with the teeth, the flat face, of warrior *A*. I could accept warrior *B* as being classical, because it looks to me fairly close to Polykleitan art. But it's warrior *A* that I cannot accept. As long as I think that the two go together, if warrior *A* is eclectic, then warrior *B* must also be eclectic. Carol Mattusch now is going a long way toward that position, pointing out how things were made from a single prototype, just modifying slightly, so that you cannot even talk about original and copy anymore, because with bronzes you could reproduce them endlessly.

LYONS: What did she say about those two sculptures?

RIDGWAY: She still thinks that they are fifth century, and I think everybody else is convinced that they are fifth century. I can only say that if they are eclectic they

cannot be fifth century; they cannot have this type of eclecticism in that period. Riace *A* has a curl that turns the corner, and you cannot have that in the fifth century, but you do have it in severizing works. So it seems to me that that is a late trait. Eventually there will be a solution . . . there probably technology might help a little bit more. The Italians of course wanted the warriors to be fifth century and they wanted them to be by Pheidias, which is again the kind of thing they do: they go for the biggest name they have. From this point of view I don't think we are going to come to an immediate solution, but there might be a chance through technology. There are some scholars who also agreed with me that they were later, but they didn't have the desire to put it in print. One of them was [Dietrich] von Bothmer, but he said, "I am not a sculpture person, therefore I will not say it, but I think I have an eye, and I agree with you."

LYONS: What specific features did he point out?

RIDGWAY: He didn't, because we didn't really discuss it, but he said, "I agree with you. I think they are late." The man has a good eye. But the people who agree know very well that they would be very much against the current, so they don't say anything publicly. I say it because I have to say what I think.

SMITH: What about the Getty Kouros controversy?

RIDGWAY: There I have to say quite honestly I really do not know. The only thing that I can say is that if it is a forgery, the person who made that kouros has a better

knowledge of archaic sculpture than I have, and I have spent my life looking at archaic sculpture. There are some details that are not even published. Some details can really be paralleled in the Merenda Kouros that is still unpublished, and how a forger would do things like this I don't know. There is this impasse there: when something in that kouros can be paralleled in something else they say, "This is where the forger took it from." When something is completely different, people say, "Oh, that's the fault of the forger, who didn't know any better." But I can parallel certain things in really obscure archaic statues that a forger would have had no way of knowing, or no way of seeing. So from this point of view I am surprised that there can be a forger that knows so much.

LYONS: What are those details?

RIDGWAY: For instance, the faceting of the fisted hands, and the knuckles. You find this in some kouroi in Delos. There is a kouros in Delos that has three facets on one hand and four on the other. It's the same statue; the hands are fused with the marble, there is no question. If this had been on the market you would have said, "Look. The forger made a mistake." But that is an excavated statue. The surface of the Getty Kouros looks terrible, and that I think is what turns everybody off. Another thing that turns everybody off is the fact that it is at the Getty. There is again the usual emotionalism.

I thought that the arguments by Ilse Kleemann at the congress [The Getty

Kouros Colloquium] in Athens [1992] were very good, because those are the kind of calculations that a forger could not possibly have made. I don't have the mathematical mind and the patience to go through all those sections and those measurements, but Ilse Kleemann does, and I can accept her findings. That is something the forger could not have reproduced. But it seems to me that it is still an open issue. I have no idea. Lots of people have told me, "I know who made that kouros," but each one gives me a different person. This is like the attributions to the various masters. I made an appeal at that congress and said, "If anybody really knows, they have the moral obligation to come forward, because we owe it to ancient art." But everybody's worried, because then there could be retaliation. It's not that I am trying to butter up the Getty. That is not what I do, and I have told the Getty what I think on many occasions. I didn't want to look at that kouros until they had bought it, because I wasn't going to advise in any form.

LYONS: Oh, so you didn't advise them on the purchase?

RIDGWAY: I didn't advise them at all. I refused to look at it until they had already bought it. Once they had bought it I wanted to look at it, but I wouldn't have advised them in any form, no. Once I saw it, I thought it was okay. The surface looks terrible . . . dull, dead, but otherwise it looks okay. There were other pieces at the Getty which I thought were forgeries, but I would never advise before they were bought. The "Tegea head" (since, officially declared a forgery) didn't look right to me

at all; it just didn't look Greek. This kouros does look authentic to me, but I have to say I don't know. I know that Eve Harrison is very much against it, and she knows archaic sculpture better than I do. In this case, you should go with her, because she certainly knows more. Probably she is right on this one and I am wrong, but I can only say what I think.

SMITH: Is this a case where technology can resolve the answer?

RIDGWAY: Well, we thought that it could. I even asked [Luc] Moens, the Belgian, and he said, "I have looked at the tests that they have done, and it seems to me that if these are the results, the results are convincing; this has to be genuine." And yet now, even Norman Herz has changed his opinion. He says that there was some difficulty with the way the tests were run.

LYONS: That they could reproduce that sort of surface structure in a lab.

RIDGWAY: Right. So I don't know. Do you know any more, now? I have lost touch completely.

LYONS: No, not since the congress, except I think more and more people are convinced it is ancient.

[Tape IV, Side One]

RIDGWAY: At the Getty Kouros [Colloquium] we were supposed to have a paper by Peter Rockwell, a practicing sculptor, and he wasn't there, so someone else read it for him. There was also a paper by Stelios Triantis, who is also a sculptor, and he is

really very good. [Georgios] Despinis is also very good, but because they are Greeks, they wouldn't have wanted to have a Greek original out of their country, so I think that unconsciously they didn't want that kouros to be right. But what hit me was that Peter Rockwell said something that was completely contradicted by what Triantis said. Here were two practicing sculptors who were saying things that could not possibly be reconciled. So one is right and the other one is wrong, but which is which? Peter Rockwell unfortunately could not come, and therefore we could not hear the debate following both papers, which would have been very helpful for us. I would have loved to hear how the two of them disagreed, because I respect both of them indiscriminately, let's say; I really have the greatest respect for them.

But Ilse Kleemann was convincing. Also, there was a Frenchman with a German name (Bernard Holtzmann), who has worked with a lot of sculpture from Thasos, and the kouros looked quite possible to him. So he was also on the fence. And the scientists were on the fence, so I don't think we got anywhere. [Ernst] Homann-Wedeking was there at the congress and he said to me, "I love the way you lecture." So I said, "Oh, you believe what I say!" And he said, "Oh, I don't believe it at all, but I love the way you lecture." [laughter] So that was the great satisfaction I got at the Getty Kouros [Colloquium], but evidently he also didn't believe the kouros was ancient, and that is scary, because Homann-Wedeking knows his archaic sculpture.

[telephone interruption—at this point a portion of the transcript was deleted at the request of the interviewee]

SMITH: We talked about your book on the severe style, and then you continue with a series of books on various periods.

RIDGWAY: Right. I couldn't have done the archaic book [*The Archaic Style in Greek Sculpture*] in six months; for that I had to have a whole sabbatical. Then I did the fifth century book [*Fifth Century Styles in Greek Sculpture*] when I was visiting in Pittsburgh. That was wonderful, because I was only teaching two courses; compared to Bryn Mawr that was nothing—a major vacation. Moreover, I was staying by myself; I really moved over there. My husband every now and then came during the weekend, but it was far enough that I couldn't really go home. So I really had lots of time.

SMITH: So when you went on sabbatical, for instance at the Institute or at Pittsburgh, your husband and the kids stayed at home?

RIDGWAY: Yes. When I was at the Institute, at first I went home every weekend, because I didn't have the help during the weekend. I would drive to Bryn Mawr on Friday evening, and then I would leave very early on Monday morning. Actually, those hours of driving were wonderful, because I was really working out all sorts of things as I was driving. I found that very fruitful, very useful. As long as I was there during the week it was okay with the Institute.

I have to tell you this anecdote. I made my bed every morning because I have always made my bed, and I cannot leave the house without making my bed. One day I found a note from the maid at the Institute that said, "Wait for me." So I waited. She said, "Why don't you let me make your bed?" I said, "Because I have always made my bed all my life." She said, "You are here to write a book. You are not here to make the bed." And I thought, "My word! Even the maids at the Institute tell you not to waste your time making your bed." I was flabbergasted. I was staying in one of the Institute's bachelor apartments eating ice cream and Rice Krispies because I wasn't going to cook. I couldn't afford to go to the cafeteria, because it was expensive. The other book was written in Pittsburgh, and at that time the children were already all grown-up. The last one was born in '64, and that book was written I think in '78, so he was already fourteen, and the others were of course older.

SMITH: The progression from severe to archaic, to fifth century to Hellenistic . . . was that accidental?

RIDGWAY: No, it wasn't. The book on the severe style came about because I had to have a proposal right away; I only had six months. Then for the book on archaic I had a whole year and the archaic was my love; I thought that that really was my period. But the more I taught, the more everything became my love, so then I did the fifth century. And then I wanted to do the fourth, but there was an archaeologist whose name will not be mentioned, who had said to me that he wanted to write a

book on the fourth century and would I please hold off in writing mine? So I said all right, but I was pretty sure that his fourth century was going to be different from my fourth century.

Time passed, I had a sabbatical, so I did the Hellenistic book. And then this person told me that his interests had changed and that book on the fourth century was not going to be written. So I thought, "Oh boy. I could have written the fourth century all along." But I think it was a blessing in disguise, because in the meantime a lot of other publications on important fourth-century monuments came out. Actually, my fourth-century book took me longer than the others, because I had retired, so instead of doing it in one year I did it in two years. I feel a little bit ashamed of that. But the computer allows me to edit a little bit more. So that's why the fourth-century book is out of sequence.

Now I want to do the second century and the first century. The Sather Lectures came at the time when I would have started writing the second century, but I had to write those lectures before I went there so that I could get it out of the way. I was planning to start writing on the second century here [at Florida State University], but the library is not really good enough, and it's under construction, so I really don't have a chance to do the kind of research that I want to do.

Usually what I do—you talk about methods—I make myself a sort of outline of chapters. I can show you because it is not a very complicated thing. For instance,

this is the fourth-century [showing notebook]. So, I write: Chapter One. What am I going to do? I want to start with the Dexileos stele, so I put under the first page what I want to do in chapter one. Then Chapter Two: everything I want to say. They are in no particular order; they are just jotted references, but these are the monuments that fit into chapter two, which is on architectural sculpture of the mainland. The chapter was going to be on all of Greek architecture, but I changed my mind and it became just architecture of the mainland, and the next chapter (3) covers non-Greek architecture in Asia Minor, so this one (chapter 4) becomes Greek architecture in Asia Minor.

So I leave blank pages and I start jotting in references, and then I start writing the chapter. As I write, I think. I write in the mornings because I am a morning person. In the afternoons I go to the library and I check all those things that I need to check. Or sometimes, if I really have to do some major research, I'm in the library in the morning and then I go back and I continue writing; this is the way the Sather Lectures were done. I decided what I was going to talk about: who, what, where, and I started putting in quotations and the kinds of things that I wanted to include as ideas came to me. I sort of decide what chapters I am going to have and then I start putting the bibliography together for those chapters. But it's based on years of teaching and researching, so it's not as if I were doing it anew.

SMITH: In the introduction to the Hellenistic sculpture book, volume one, you say

that you are not trying to argue against current opinion just for the sake of being different. I was wondering if you could expound on that statement.

RIDGWAY: That was more of a response to criticism, because, first of all, some people have even said, "She publishes her lecture notes." Which is not true. That's why, in one of my prefaces, I don't remember which one, I said, "My students can be my witnesses that I never talked from notes." And the other criticism was this idea that I was really trying to be original at all costs, and I wasn't. I hope now that you have met me, since you seem to have read some of my works, that you see that I am all of one piece, as it were, and what I say in my books is really what I would say to you in conversation, because I really believe these things. In my prefaces I try to respond to criticism that has been made through the years, because I don't think it's correct. Not that they cannot criticize my work, but they cannot criticize my intentions as they do, because these are not my intentions. The opinions, well sure, they are entitled, because I certainly don't know myself whether I am right or wrong. But to say, "She is doing it in order to be original," or, "She is publishing her lecture notes." That, no. I want to set them right, because that's not what I do.

SMITH: Okay. You also say that your work re-opens issues that have been considered closed. Could you give an example from your books of an issue that the community had considered settled that you were going to re-open again?

RIDGWAY: Well, of course there are lots of them. Some of them come to me as I

write, obviously. But I'll mention one issue which again goes back to archaic, and it is not so much my theory: the idea that the korai are wearing costumes that are the same at the top and at the bottom, although the textures as indicated by the sculptor are different. I accepted completely Judith Schaeffer's idea that some of these korai were wearing skirts; I think that's completely correct, but nobody else has accepted this idea. So I keep working on that because I keep thinking that people really should see that there are cases in which the costume includes a third element. But these are minor issues.

Now you say, why is this important? I think it's important because if you understand whether a costume is an indoor or an outdoor costume, it might give you some understanding of what the figure is trying to represent. Who were the korai? To this day, we can't say that we know. So one can present theories. These are big, open questions, and I'd like to continue working on them. Gloria Pinney is doing a lot of work on this; she has all sorts of new theories that are very interesting. So these are not closed issues, and I particularly hope the students will continue working on them.

SMITH: I think at the time the phone rang, I was beginning to pose the question, if the Getty Kouros is valid, then doesn't that require a rethinking of archaic sculpture?

RIDGWAY: No, it doesn't. Actually, one of the things that has been said against the Getty Kouros is that we are not learning anything new from it; it is very much along

the lines of the others. It's just one more statue.

SMITH: There are three other articles that I'd like to discuss.

RIDGWAY: Don't tell me that you have been reading all these things.

SMITH: Well, that's what I am supposed to do. [laughter]

RIDGWAY: The poor man. I hope you are interested in sculpture.

SMITH: I look at it from a different perspective. I am interested in how people put ideas together.

RIDGWAY: And how do I put them together?

SMITH: Well . . .

RIDGWAY: Now, this is terrible, because here I am opening up my life to you and you don't say a word. That's not fair.

SMITH: I'm not supposed to.

RIDGWAY: Eventually you have to.

SMITH: Eventually, but not on tape. There are three articles that are a little different in nature because they are survey articles, and the first is "The State of Research on Ancient Art" [*Art Bulletin* 68 (1986): 7–23].

RIDGWAY: Ah, okay. Those sometimes are commissioned articles, and, oh boy, do they bring in a lot of criticism, I hate to tell you. The art historians still don't talk to me because I discussed my definition of art history versus archaeology. Our own Charles Mitchell, who at that time was head of the Art History Department at Bryn

Mawr, was furious, because he said, "Art history, when it's done properly, as art history should be, is very much like archaeology." I agree, but that is usually not the way it is done; it's usually done somewhat along the lines of art appreciation, rather than really being fundamental art history. If you remember, there was also a follow-up article by somebody.

SMITH: Right, [William] Hood, I think his name was.

RIDGWAY: Yes, and I responded to that with a private letter, pointing out some of his mistakes; he sent me a private letter to thank me, because I had not tried to do it on the open pages. That is one thing that you can say about me: I will never deliberately say something nasty about somebody. When I write a book review, I will always try to point out good sides, even when I disagree with a lot of other things. I find that there is far too much acrimony in some of the dealings of archaeologists. People really cut other people down ferociously, and I will never do that, because it's a matter of opinions. We are all entitled to our own opinions; I can criticize an idea, but I'm not going to criticize a person. So from that point of view I will never be deliberately nasty in any of my writings.

SMITH: But if you disagree with somebody's methodology—

RIDGWAY: I will say so, and I have said so. I just finished a review [*Archaeology News* 20(1997): 43–44] of [Guy P. R.] Métraux's book [*Sculptors and Physicians in Fifth-Century Greece: A Preliminary Study*] on the application of medicine, or

medical knowledge of the time to ancient sculpture. I think the principle is fine, but I think his methodology is all wrong. I had to say that because he takes three completely disparate monuments and he's trying to analyze them, and you cannot do that. So I said so, but I tried to say it in such a way that I hope I didn't hurt his feelings. But you were talking about the article that I did for the *Art Bulletin*. That one I think they asked me to do because I was the editor of the *AJA*. I don't think they asked me to do it because I was an authority on Greek sculpture, or on Greek art. It's because being the editor of *AJA* I really had to see a cross-section of what was turned in.

SMITH: But you are also an archaeologist who focuses on a subject that is traditionally art history's purview as well.

RIDGWAY: Yes, but so is Eve Harrison. So was George Hanfmann. He was also excavating, but I could point to several people who are doing my type of research. And there are archaeologists who are teaching in art history departments, whereas I wasn't, I was really teaching in the archaeology department. No, I really think it was *AJA* at that time—that's the reason why they asked me. The other article ["The Study of Ancient Sculpture" *AJA* 86 (1982):155–157] was for the sculpture issue of *AJA*; that I did on my own. The third article ["The Study of Classical Sculpture at the End of the Twentieth Century." *AJA* 98 (1994):759–72] was a review article that Fred [S.] Kleiner had asked me to do. I had said, "No, I have already done it, and I am not

going to do it again."

I was writing *The Fourth Century* at that time, and this book [*Scultura greca del IV secolo: maestri e scuole di statuaria tra classicità ed ellenismo*] by [Luigi] Todisco came out, and I think it cost $300. So I said, "If you will let me review that book, I will use it as a springboard for the discussion of how sculpture has moved." Because it's a typical example; it is stuck at the time of [Adolf] Furtwängler completely. It's a very knowledgeable book, and yet it makes absolutely no distinction between the Roman copies and the originals, and it can have two attributions that are conflicting . . . that kind of thing. So I thought that that would really give me a way of saying certain things. So Fred Kleiner got the book for me, I saved $300, and I wrote the article.

SMITH: In that article you cite Mieke Bal's and Norman Bryson's article in *Art Bulletin* on semiotics in art.

RIDGWAY: Yes, I read that; it took me a while. It was a major struggle. We usually refer to it as "Bal and Bryson." Actually, Gloria Pinney was the reason I read that article, because she started working along those lines, and the way she explains semiotics makes sense to me. So I thought, "Well, okay, if it makes sense that way, let me now read this article." So I read it, and it didn't make nearly as much sense as Gloria was making, but it was a good article; I really could get something out of it. I also read [Salvatore] Settis's preface to the book by [Clemente] Marconi on the

metopes of the Temple of Hera at Selinous and that made a lot of sense to me. So it isn't that I am against theory, but it has to be the kind of theory that I really can understand. If it is so theoretical that I don't understand it, then I don't want to use it.

I very much like Andrew Stewart; as a matter of fact, I was delighted that we were together at Berkeley because it made me see a side of him that I didn't know. He really is very nice with the students, and I was worried that maybe he wasn't. But he sometimes writes things with which I cannot agree. I think he gets carried away by his own eloquence and by the fact that he can write so well. He wrote an article on the Nike of Samothrace, and I don't agree with a word of it, despite the fact that it's wonderful prose. I think he puts too much emphasis on the idea of the wind, and the metaphor of the state, and boulders, and the ship coming into port, and so on. If you have ever stood at the prow of a ship, which I have done, the wind buffets you tremendously, no matter what. So I don't think that there is the implication of a storm around the Nike of Samothrace. The water can be completely calm, but if the ship is moving, you are going to get that kind of wind.

When Andrew Stewart says, "This was the intention of the sculptor: to indicate the storm, and yet at the same time the victory, the conclusion, the arrival in the port," I think his own eloquence is carrying him away. It is a kind of overreading of a text. Sure, a text is interpreted by every reader, and every reader reads his own mind, but I think it is *his own mind*; one has to understand that it wasn't necessarily

the mind of the person who made the statue. So that to me is not valid.

SMITH: As I understand semiotic theory, meaning is determined by the suppression of alternate meanings, so in order to determine what something is saying, you also have to have what are the absented messages. Now, can you do that with classical work?

RIDGWAY: No, no. And that is a way in which I really don't know the theory that much. But to say the Greeks spoke through symbols, that I completely agree with. This is why I am interested in costume, because I think to us it might not say anything anymore, but to them it would have said something. So I agree that semiotics can help you, because they are saying it's a system of messages, of symbols that try to communicate. It's just that we are speaking a different language. I would agree with that approach insofar as it makes me look at those symbols as forms of communication.

SMITH: You note in that article that semiotic theory has been very valuable for vase painting, but not so much for sculpture.

RIDGWAY: That is because of Gloria Pinney, because of her work.

LYONS: And some of the French archaeologists.

RIDGWAY: Right, and also Joan Reilly. I think what she did with grave stelai was very good. Here is another example of how Bryn Mawr works. Joan's dissertation was on sculpture, but because she wanted to use these new theories, she did it with

Gloria, so I helped where I could, but it wasn't done with me. So Bryn Mawr was not so compartmentalized that one said, "This is so-and-so's student and I'm not going to touch it." And that is the way it should be, I think.

SMITH: Could you elaborate on your criticism of Joan Connelly's theory in this article [*The Study of Classical Sculpture at the End of the 20th Century*]?

RIDGWAY: Do I criticize it?

SMITH: Well, you're not entirely enthused about it.

RIDGWAY: Well, I can tell you what I think, if you want to put it on a different level. First of all, when I put that out, I don't think that she had published her thoughts yet, because I think her article ("Parthenon and Parthenoi: A Mythological Interpretation of the Parthenon Frieze" *AJA* 100 (1996): 53–80) came out in 1996. I like that article very much; I think it's very thorough, very well documented, and she argues her case very well. Some of the points that she had left unanswered in her lectures are now answered very well.

I can tell you the two things that I like most about her approach. One, she is trying something completely different. She is quite right in saying all our theories about the Parthenon frieze so far have not been able to satisfy completely all the difficulties that we have in looking at it. Obviously, we don't have the right theory, otherwise those difficulties would disappear, so let's try something completely different. Also, if it is true that there is a mythological meaning behind the frieze, as

Connelly suggests, that would be very much in keeping with the way the Greeks were doing architectural sculpture. So from this point of view, I think it's great.

But I still have doubts about her theory. The weak point I think, and there I would agree with Eve Harrison, has to do with the youthful figure handling the peplos; the mantle is draped in a certain way. A woman can wear a mantle that way, but it would leave the torso bare; so that could not be possible, because that figure is only wearing one costume. So, if that is the case, that figure is a boy. I think Joan Connelly is completely correct in pointing out that since there wasn't a great differentiation between male and female bodies in the fifth century, whether something *looks* female or male has no meaning. Completely valid. But the figure, if the costume is worn that way, has to be male, and if the figure is male, then the whole theory collapses. I'm sorry, because I would have liked a different theory. So that is the reason why I have my reservations.

In my own mind I have found a solution, I think, to the question of why all twelve gods are there in the Parthenon frieze, and why Athena is just one of them. Again, it was Gloria who really opened up my mind, because in pointing out that the Panathenaic festival was the commemoration of the victory over the giants, and all the gods had participated, it was perfectly correct to have all of them there. This was one of the sticky points: if it is the Panathenaic procession, a festival for Athena, why do you have all the Olympians there? But if it is for commemorating the Gigantomachy,

then you have a very good reason for their presence. That is not crucial, you see, but what is crucial to Connelly's argument is the fact that the figure has to be a girl for the interpretation to be valid. I really think that she is pointing out that we have not solved the problem of the Parthenon frieze, and therefore the more we think about it, the better. I don't take it as a personal offense that it is not what I said it was. On the contrary, I think, "How great, let us continue working."

I know that some people have been really upset about her theory. Unfortunately, I think one of the reasons why they are upset is because the newspapers have picked it up, and that has nothing to do with Joan Connelly. She wasn't going after the newspapers, the newspapers went after her, because it is a hot topic; it's the Parthenon, it is something involving human sacrifice, it is something to do with women's liberation and women's contributions. So the newspapers picked it up, and the archaeologists immediately put their back up when something like this happens because they think that a person is looking for cheap propaganda. I think some of the criticism of her is really an unconscious reaction to the media reports.

Another aspect of this reaction by scholars, if you want to hear it, is that Joan Connelly is very cute; she is really a very lovely looking person. There is another student of mine, who is quite scholarly, but for the longest time she was considered a dumb blonde, simply because she was cute. She was blonde and she was good looking, so people automatically assumed that she could not do serious scholarly

work. So I think this also is held out against Joan Connelly, and that is despicable to my mind.

LYONS: Plus the fact that she's been awarded a MacArthur grant.

RIDGWAY: Ah, well, this has been even worse, but that is I think envy, and people shouldn't be envious.

LYONS: It should indicate that there's an appreciation of this kind of original research.

RIDGWAY: Yes, but you know what people have been saying about her MacArthur, which again, I think is really terrible: they have been saying, "Oh, it's because Homer Thompson has a lot of influence with the MacArthur." I don't think it's true. I don't think it has anything to do with that. I think that this is envy speaking, and I'm sorry, because one should always be pleased that people are encouraged to do more creative thinking. It's too bad that there has been this reaction to Joan Connelly. Olga Palagia wrote something in the *London Times Literary Supplement* which was really very nasty.

LYONS: I wanted to follow up on a question that we started talking about when you mentioned Andrew Stewart before, because recently he's written a book on gender and sexuality—

RIDGWAY: Oh boy, yes, he gave me a copy of that.

LYONS: He's dealing with these questions, so I'm interested in your reaction to that

direction.

RIDGWAY: Okay. Again, you have to make a distinction between what I think of the person and what I think of the work. To start with the person, I think Andrew is enormously knowledgeable. I admire his knowledge of history and his knowledge of the classics; he really has them at his fingertips. He keeps up with the bibliography tremendously. He is very good at trying to recreate backgrounds. However, and now comes the however: I don't think he looks at sculpture the way I look at sculpture. We went to see this exhibition of Macedonian art in St. Petersburg, Florida, and he wanted to convince me that two heads were by the same hand. I was completely convinced that they were not, and I tried to tell him why. It is quite clear that we look at an object differently.

But this has nothing to do with it. I asked him to come and sit in on my seminar at Berkeley, because I know he disagrees with me. I thought that this would be very good for the students. Everybody was surprised that I wanted him there, because they knew that we disagreed, but it was very fruitful. Actually, it turned out that we didn't disagree that much when it came down to real points. However, he is interested in things that don't interest me in the least. I would have never been able to write the kind of book that he has written. I don't have that kind of mind, and I don't particularly like it.

LYONS: Why not? Sculpture is about bodies and the representation of bodies.

RIDGWAY: Yes, but he is putting an interpretation of what it means, and I don't think that that interpretation can be derived from the sculptures, necessarily. Now, his book has some very good observations. In his observations of details he has really made some very interesting points, but it's the total approach that to me seems unnecessary. Also, some of it I don't understand. I don't understand about homosexuality. What to him is an erotic symbol to me is not at all erotic; it causes no reaction whatsoever in me. I cannot look at a piece of sculpture and be aroused by it. His interpretation of the Aphrodite of Knidos, where he brings in the viewer, I don't think is correct, because I think she is over lifesize, and she would have been on a tall pedestal. Her glance would not have been on the humans at all. She would have been looking out into space. Therefore, the moment you are applying this system of triangulation and glance for a statue that is over lifesize and on a pedestal, that is not going to work. But I'm not going to tell Andrew that.

SMITH: But isn't there enough evidence of what the Greeks and Romans thought was erotic at various points that one can then extrapolate?

RIDGWAY: Yes, but I am not interested in that.

SMITH: No, but to determine whether something might have been within their vocabulary of the erotic, you have both literature and then you have clearly what could be pornographic—

RIDGWAY: Sure, but when it comes to interpreting statues, I really think we end up

by being subjective, because they can tell you what they think is erotic, and they can have all these anecdotes, but that doesn't necessarily mean that that was the intent for which a certain work was created. So I don't want to go in that direction.

SMITH: You mentioned yesterday that the very first problem that Carpenter posed for you was to arrange the kouroi based on looking at them—

RIDGWAY: In terms of what I could see for stylistic development. Actually, I did it in a very funny way, because I wrote my thesis backward. I figured 480 was the one date we had, so I moved backward. Instead of arranging them from the earliest to the latest, I arranged them from the latest to the earliest. At that time I was still going by Carpenter's theory that there was really a naturalistic development. Now I don't believe it anymore.

SMITH: Well, there's a case where how you see things is shaded by your theory, at the very least; that if you have an evolutionary view of development, then you are going to see it—

RIDGWAY: Yes, but you can still see, for instance, whether you have straight zig zags or whether you have double curves. That is something objective, and that tells you that one piece is later than another. In a way, you might say that this is what Miss [Gisela] Richter did, although she made it so rigid with the kouroi and the korai that that is why people don't follow her theories so much. But she is still very extensively quoted.

SMITH: When you wrote an article ten years ago, "Ancient Greek Women and Art: the Material Evidence," [*AJA* 91 (1987): 399–409] you seemed to be coming back to this question.

RIDGWAY: That's another thing. No, that again was a commissioned thing. Somebody asked me to participate in this conference and I was to give a lecture. I said, "I am not a feminist, I am not going to involve myself in these topics." And the person said, "But we are doing women as sponsors"; that was the title of the whole conference. They were doing women as sponsors in the Renaissance and in later periods; it was really very interesting. So I said, "Okay, from this objective point of view, I can do it." I gave this lecture and thought nothing more of it. Then I started receiving a lot of requests from doctors, from psychologists, from people I would never have expected to hear from, because there was a very varied audience. They wanted a copy of the lecture, and of course I didn't have it written. I had a list of slides, but that was it. So because I had nothing to send to people, and there were all these requests, and especially because these were people in different fields, I wrote it out and I sent it to *AJA*. They took it, but they changed the title; it was originally "Women as Sponsors."

I feel very strongly, as I mentioned before, and as I mention in some of my articles, that because people jumped on the bandwagon of feminism, everybody had this idea of the oppressed Greek woman, and I was trying to show that there was

quite an influential sphere for Greek women, and I think the pendulum now is swinging back. As a matter of fact, I found more examples after I finished that article that I wish I could have added. There is the wonderful example of the temple at Thespiai, a temple to Demeter and Kore, and it was built by women, not built physically, but with their money. Everybody had to contribute no more than five drachmas. The reason we know is because they inscribed a list of the contributing women on a stele, and we have found the stele. It has all the accounts, what woman gave what, and those who couldn't give money gave jewelry. Here are the women of Thespiai building a temple. It's fantastic, and people disregard all these things: "Oh, these poor depressed women."

SMITH: At the end of your article "The Study of Classical Sculpture," you talk about archaeology still struggling between science and humanism. I think you are implying then that much of this incorporation of theory is taking it back towards a humanistic interpretive scheme rather than a scientific—

RIDGWAY: Well, I think this is now again a reaction to the New Archaeology, because it had completely dispensed with anything that had to do with art as a manifestation; it was anthropology all the way. It is the kind of approach that I don't particularly agree with. You set yourself a problem and then you go out and solve it. Whereas I like it the other way around: I like to solve what comes my way; I don't set out with a theory that I'm trying to confirm. But because there was so much done

with the New Archaeology and anthropology, people are beginning to look more at the other aspects. It is true that archaeology is not art history, or pure sculpture, or architecture. Archaeology should be a global study; we are trying to reach antiquity, and I think that therefore every aspect of antiquity provides insights, and nothing should be left out. So I absolutely am in agreement with the anthropological studies, with the stratigraphy, with the excavations. Any method that works is fine, but I don't think we should close our eyes to art, to sculpture, and architecture; we should try to understand these things.

SMITH: Well, if archaeology is this body of information that's been collected over the centuries, you can still ask different questions of it, and if your published work comes out of your lectures, then that implies an interaction with your audiences, which are students and other professionals.

RIDGWAY: With the students, for sure. With the audience, I'm not so sure. Maybe in the sense that they ask me to give specific topics. But I was thinking about a question you asked me yesterday. You wanted to know why I had gone into archaeology, even back in Italy. Archaeology embodies everything that I have always loved. For instance, I always loved writing; even when I was young, I always used to write poetry. I am sure that every young person at some point writes poetry. I loved literature, I loved writing, I loved art, I loved traveling, I loved languages, I loved Greek and Latin, I loved ancient history. And I told you how interested I was

in philosophy. Archaeology all of a sudden put all these things together for me. It embodied everything that I have always liked, and it allowed me to do all of them, including traveling, which is great. I never saw archaeology as being just sculpture. Yes, what I write on is sculpture, but what I teach is much, much wider. I do have a background in the literature, in the history, and in the philosophy. This is part of my upbringing. Whether I apply it correctly or not is a different point, but I have it as part of me.

[Tape IV, Side Two]

RIDGWAY: This is a question I have answered over and over again: why did I study archaeology at Bryn Mawr? Okay. My answer is twofold. One, because archaeology allows you to use your imagination. You really look at all these clues, and you have to make out a scenario that accounts for all of them. You create all these theories, you learn to use your eyes, you learn to use your mind, you learn to think rationally, and you present a case. Then the second thing that archaeology does for you: it forces you to keep an open mind, because after you have made up this beautiful theory, there comes an excavation season that brings out something that shows that your theory is all wrong, and you have to say, "That was wrong, I now have to look at it in a different view." I think Homer Thompson is a wonderful example of that. He put out a lot of theories and then he was the first one who said, "This is no longer valid; we must now think in these other terms." He was very open-

minded about that.

So you develop an imagination and open-mindedness, and I think those are two qualities that can hold you in good stead no matter where you go. I really saw this when I was called to jury duty. I even wrote an article about it that doesn't show in my bibliography because it was for the college newspaper. It was a sequestered jury, and we were taken away to a place near Pittsburgh because the case had made such a splash in the local area that they didn't think that they could get a jury that was completely unopinionated. So they went elsewhere to pick up the jurors. Of course, I had absolutely no idea of anything because I don't read the newspapers. I felt for sure they wouldn't take me. My husband was in the hospital because he had a bad back. I had Christopher alone at home, disabled. I was a faculty member, I was on the appointments committee, I was a foreigner. I thought for sure they would not take me. Instead, they took me, for a variety of reasons. One, because they thought that since one of the accused was the age of one of my children, I would be more sympathetic.

It was a very difficult case, because they were trying only one murder, but evidently the defendant, as we found out afterwards, had committed several murders. But they could not bring in any of the evidence from the other murders. So, there were big gaps in what we were being told, but we had to go by what we were told; it was quite clear that it was a complicated case. When it came to the discussion for the

jury, I was made forewoman, and it became absolutely clear to me that my training in archaeology was wonderful. Not only had I been able to pay attention throughout, because I can concentrate, but I also have a good memory for detail—you are not allowed to take notes in Pennsylvania. Moreover, I could distinguish fact from theory; I was trained to do that. I could say, "This is a fact, but this is speculation; we cannot be sure." What was so completely obvious to me was not obvious to the others, and it really was a great surprise to me. This is why maybe archaeologists make wonderful lawyers; they can research the evidence and they can evaluate it.

So I think that archaeology can do these things for you. Eventually we convicted, and then the judge called us into his chambers and said, "Jury, I am proud of you. We couldn't tell you this, but these people had already received the death penalty anyhow. We were forced by law to try each case separately, and we were so worried that you wouldn't see what was happening, because we couldn't give you the entire evidence." There were some people in the jury who were a little upset with me because they weren't convinced; they voted that way but they weren't convinced. When the judge praised us they were all so proud of themselves. But it really came down to the fact that I could distinguish between fact and theory. I think that is a wonderful thing that archaeology can do for a person.

SMITH: Where do you see your work going over the next five years? What kind of projects?

RIDGWAY: I am going to write these two books (to finish my series on sculpture), and then I will write my memoirs, because it has occurred to me that my children really know nothing about my life. I want to tell them especially about my early years, which would be of no interest to you. I really want to tell them that, so I think probably I will write about the war in Ethiopia and all the things that happened to me. Also, I am losing my office. I don't belong in the department anymore, and it really wouldn't be fair for me to be a shadow trying to remind everybody, "Oh, in my days we did things this way." I don't think that's fair; I think we should give a chance to the new people, and there are a lot of new people in the department. Let them do it their own way. I don't even think that my presence is such a good thing.

So I will do archaeology because I love archaeology, but I'm going to do it on my own. Finishing these two books will take me some time. If something enticing comes along, like the Sather Lectures, or Florida, how could I resist? But otherwise I really will try to resist offers as much as possible. I am going to take a cruise as archaeology lecturer on the Sea Cloud, because I want to go on a sailing vessel. Otherwise, I think I will just enjoy myself. The last time that we were together at the philosophical society—and I understand he died, the poor man, I'm so sorry—Jim [James B.] Pritchard said he had reached the blessed stage of being able to read a book without taking notes. I think I want to reach that stage. I want to read an archaeology book and not necessarily take notes.

SMITH: Can you look at a sculpture and forget that you are a professional?

RIDGWAY: No, but I am getting very old. I am sixty-seven. I will be sixty-eight in November. Eventually I will become senile. And I have two more books.

SMITH: Have you thought about or looked into the history and the theory of sculpture in general? Do you have any interest in twentieth-century sculpture?

RIDGWAY: No, no. But I tell you, I really respond to Brancusi. Brancusi really talks to me, because he's almost archaic. You know, I love *The Kiss*, that turns the corner, and that kind of thing, and the type of shapes he uses. I love Rodin, and Michelangelo of course. I was at the Louvre recently, and I couldn't believe it; everybody was around three pieces: the *Monna Lisa*, the *Victory of Samothrace*, and the *Aphrodite of Melos*. Nobody was looking at *The Prisoner* by Michelangelo. Nobody. There wasn't a soul in that room. People just have their photograph taken with the Aphrodite of Melos and they go away. Nobody looks at the sculpture. It's really a terrible commentary on our society. Michelangelo is the kind of sculptor that I can completely respond to, but otherwise, no. Modern art doesn't say a thing to me. The more modern, the less I understand it, nor do I want to understand it. You know what I love? Eskimo sculpture. Because it's the same kind of thing; it's trying to see the shape within the block, and it's a very tactile kind of sculpture.

I am afraid I am going to disappoint you, because you think you are immortalizing here the memoirs of a person who has this great mind and has this great

conception of sculpture, and it's not true at all. I don't have any major theory, I don't have any cosmic vision, I am not that kind of a person. Nor have I written in order to create a school. It scares me when people talk about the "Ridgway Rangers." You know, this has been done. One of my students was introduced as one of the "Ridgway Rangers." There are no such things. There are students who go out and think with their own mind. That, yes, but not in the sense that they are following a specific theory.

SMITH: How would you compare your teaching style with Carpenter's? Carpenter is someone that you have said has influenced your thinking.

RIDGWAY: Yes, obviously. I can hear Carpenter when I talk. Some of the things I say are things that he said, I know. So I suppose I have patterned myself after my teacher, but he had a more global conception. He did think of sculpture, and this has influenced me enormously, as something that was more an anonymous product, not the great masters. I have followed this throughout, because I have convinced myself that we don't really know that much about the great masters. I think that is what Carpenter already had in mind, and I think eventually people will see that we don't know that much about the great names, but because we have been brought up in the tradition of Vasari, we are doing "lives of sculptors" and we are trying to reconstruct all these things without having enough evidence. So from that point of view, yes, Carpenter's teaching is the fundamental impulse to my own.

SMITH: Amongst your peers, who are the people that you have felt closest to, the people with whom you could have informal discussions that would then lead to rethinking problems?

RIDGWAY: Okay, very definitely, Carl Nylander. Because, again, our association was very lively. He is a Renaissance man, so we had wonderful debates that way. Gloria Pinney was a great influence, from a different angle. But otherwise I don't know that I ever had much time for a great deal of discussion. But it's amazing what supervising Ph.D. dissertations does for you, because I really have supervised a lot of both M.A.s and Ph.D.s, and that is a great deal of interaction with the students. But Kyle Phillips was the one who actually started this idea that the Roman copies probably are not so faithful, and this was something that he said very casually one day.

LYONS: So you did have a lot of intellectual exchanges?

RIDGWAY: Yes, we did, we did. With Kyle I admired his intellectual perceptions, I just couldn't agree with the behavior.

SMITH: You were saying yesterday afterwards that there was a negative side to him that interfered with the workings of the department.

RIDGWAY: Yes, right. Do you really want to know about this?

SMITH: Sure, yes.

RIDGWAY: Okay. It's quite clear that he played favorites. He actually tried to

convince some people to study with him and he would do special things for them. So he alienated some students from other members of the department, and then when he tired of them, he dropped them. I don't think you should do that to a student. [to Lyons:] You know examples of people who were dropped. And the students were traumatized. To me, that was impossible; that was not the way to deal with students. There is no such thing as "my student" and "your student." I heard that he even told people not to take seminars with me. I never told a student not to take one with Kyle. On the contrary, I told them to take his seminars. But he evidently wanted to have his own following.

I think he was insecure. Not that I am a tower of security, but I never felt that I needed that. I thought he victimized the students, and I thought he didn't supervise them enough. I was carrying part of his load, because his students had to come to me. I thought that he wasn't pulling his weight, and this became so acute, and I thought the students were so victimized, that I resigned. We had a major conference with the president, and she called all the members of the department and she had us try to air it out. He was already at Villa Massenzia (a villa in Rome that had been donated to Bryn Mawr College to establish a students' center) at that time. So I said what I had to say, and I mentioned names, because it was important. Kyle of course didn't say anything about it; he said, "Yes, yes, yes," and went back to Massenzia. And then things precipitated completely. But the president had at least tried to do

something. Machteld would not do anything; she could not confront Kyle in any form.

SMITH: Do you think he was able to get away with this because he was a man in a woman's environment?

RIDGWAY: No, I think it was because he was an excavator. I think it was because Machteld felt that what he was doing was very important. She always said, "Can you think of anybody else who would be better in his position than he is?" And intellectually I had to say no, of course not. He was very good, he was very good. This was what was killing, that he could do so much. He did a lot with the students, but then there were times when, if a student didn't interest him, he didn't do anything with that student, and you cannot do that. In my life I've disliked a couple of students. As a result, I bent over backwards to do more for them because I was feeling guilty that I disliked them! Instead, if Kyle disliked students, he wouldn't give them the time of day. You cannot do that to a student.

So to me it was very much a question of principle and what was happening on the level of his teaching. His dark side was that with some students he even put pressure of a different nature. At that time I wasn't even quite so much aware of it, but I know that to some people he made homosexual advances. I went to see his excavation and I noticed that there were some people that he was promoting, not because they were good excavators or good archaeologists, they weren't even

archaeologists in one case, but because he had a special interest in them. He tended to favor male students over female students. Now, I have no objection to him being a homosexual, but this should not influence his teaching, which to me was essential. His behavior toward the students had to be asexual.

I didn't cultivate male students because I wanted to have a romantic affair with them; it didn't cross my mind. A student is a student. It can be a woman and it can be a man, and it is exactly the same. There are men at Bryn Mawr at the graduate level. We also have the Haverford College undergraduate students. So I taught lots of male students. But they were students. You don't say, "he's a male student," or "she's a female student" the way you don't say "that's an Asian student," or "that is an African student." They can be pink with polka dots; they are students. That to me is paramount; it's essential.

LYONS: So the result of this was that his directorship of the Villa Massenzia in Italy ended at that point, and then within the department there was a rupture.

RIDGWAY: Well, but he was then trying to lure students to Massenzia because he needed to have bodies there, and you [Lyons] knew how he treated them at Massenzia. Some of them fled Massenzia in fear, in panic for their life. I had to interrupt my sabbatical to go and take over. I was so scared; when the students were away from Massenzia for the holidays, the president told me to have my sister come up from Messina and stay with me so that I wouldn't be alone there. He was

obviously becoming paranoid, and eventually he died of AIDS. I don't know whether this might have affected his mind in some form, but it was a real shame, because it was a first-class mind. This I will always say and will always recognize; it was all the more regrettable therefore that he couldn't bring this very good mind to bear. He was an inspiring teacher. From that point of view he was a very good person to have in the department, but you cannot do what he did to students.

I have to teach a class this afternoon. Am I giving you what you want?

SMITH: Yes.

RIDGWAY: Because I am afraid I am much more frank, probably, than what you had expected.

SMITH: No. The frankness is what we want. If you think of this interview as it will be perceived two hundred years from now, when no one will be left who could be offended, it will give a sense of what the patterns of relationships were.

RIDGWAY: This is like style; it's a very personal conception. It's what I feel, what I think, how I react to certain things. It's not *the truth*.

SMITH: But wouldn't you like to have little glimpses of that for the fifth century?

RIDGWAY: I don't know, I don't know. This is why to me it is so validating to have Claire here, because I feel that to some extent I don't say things that are completely unfounded. She is a person who has lived through some of these things, and she can tell you that it really is so. Because how do I know that it really is so? Now here we

go with Descartes and *cogito ergo sum*. There must be some truth in it, but I'm not so sure, it could just be my vision. It cannot be necessarily objective truth. People said that I was envious of Kyle in Massenzia, which was not at all the truth, because even if I had been given the directorship of Massenzia I could not have accepted it. I couldn't go to Italy and leave my family, and I could not have taken them and transferred them to Italy. So I wasn't envious at all; it didn't touch me in the least. But people were saying that, and that was hurting my feelings.

Not only that, but I had a family in Italy that was in a very good position, and if I had wanted to have the easy life there I could have had it at any time. I didn't have to be at Bryn Mawr, struggling. When we were just married, my sister wrote to me—we wrote every week, I have a stack of letters. By the way, Richard asked me a while ago what I was going to do with my free time over the next five years. I am going to go through all my letters that I wrote every week to my family and see what my reactions to the United States were, because at that time of course everything was new. Anyway, we kept in touch that way. My sister said, "Who washes your dishes?" We were just married, living in one room, so I wrote back and said, "Dear Sister, I am washing my own dishes." For her that was inconceivable, because we were used to a lot of maids and orderlies and the nanny, and so on. Also, she probably didn't think I was capable of washing dishes, because I had never done anything of the sort. And so it wasn't that I needed Massenzia, and yet people did say

that I was jealous of Kyle, that I was envious of him. You [Lyons] probably know more than I do the kinds of things that people were saying.

LYONS: Well, everybody has their own impressions; it was so complicated and emotional, it was just too difficult to work it out.

RIDGWAY: They thought I was his great enemy, and yet that night, before we went to the conference with the president, I was on my knees at church praying, hoping I was doing the right thing, because I didn't want to ruin a person. I went to confession and I said to the priest, "What do I do? Do I move against a colleague?" And he said, "You have to do what your conscience says. As long as you know that you are not doing it to improve your own situation." I knew I wasn't doing it for that reason. I resigned, which to me was really making the ground shake under my feet, because I was so Bryn Mawr, for me to think of going anywhere else would have killed me completely. I have received several offers from other institutions that were really pretty lucrative and appealing, but I was never able to leave Bryn Mawr. Bryn Mawr has always meant so much to me. It's not that the other places were not good enough, it's just that Bryn Mawr had a slightly different standard that really appealed to me.

SMITH: But was Bryn Mawr able to match the salary?

RIDGWAY: No, it didn't make any difference to them at all. You know, when I took the *AJA* editorship, the president, Pat [Mary Patterson] McPherson, said to me,

"You are not going to get a reduced teaching load. If you do it, you do it at your own risk and peril." They couldn't even spare an office. Nothing. They said, "You will have to do it on top of everything else." I said okay. That's Bryn Mawr for you.

SESSION THREE: 28 MARCH, 1997

[Tape V, Side One]

RIDGWAY: You were saying, and you sounded as if you were impressed by it, that I had written something like eighty articles or more, and I told you the Italians were not all that impressed. On the contrary, they say to me, "Why do you write so little?" Compare my output to Erika Simon. She is unbelievable. Compare it to John Boardman's, who writes a paperback book over the weekend. [laughter] Yes, I haven't written that much, but one of the things that occurred to me of course is that at Bryn Mawr we teach a lot more. I think this should be pointed out, because in Italy they don't even begin to teach the way we teach.

My second point is that even in the United States, people have research assistants, but I have never had a research assistant. Not so much because I couldn't have arranged for it, but because I wouldn't know how to use one. I am so used to doing things by myself. Also, I find that when I am researching something, I can find something completely extraneous that interests me, which is then relevant for something else, so to me the research process is part of the fun, and I am not going to delegate it to somebody else. I have never had anybody even double-check my references the way some scholars do, or bring things to me. I really do my own work, and I think that is an important point, because what to you might seem like a decent number of articles, to other people has definitely seemed an insufficient output.

You were also asking me about theories that I was particularly pleased with, or theories that could be proved. Well, two of my theories actually have been resolved, and I'm really very pleased about that. One was a very early work, on the Piombino Apollo in the Louvre. By now I think that everybody has accepted that it is not archaic. At the time, when I put out that idea, Miss Richter came out with a new edition of her book on kouroi, and she said, "Well, she's right, it's not archaic, but it is severe." Which is the last thing that I would have wanted to say. I said it was late, it was first century B.C. I think by now it has been shown on technical grounds, and on alloy, that indeed it is late. So that one at least is resolved. And there technology has helped.

The other example of a problem solved was the Porticello Head. I mentioned it in my section of the book edited by Cynthia Jones Eiseman [*The Porticello Shipwreck: A Mediterranean Merchant Vessel of 415–385 B.C.*], but I don't know that many people have really seen it. At the time these objects were confiscated, after they had been picked up by clandestine divers, George [F.] Bass and David Owen circulated photographs of the Porticello Head even though it was still all encrusted, because they thought at the time that it could be a portrait of Homer. So they asked for my opinion, and at the time I said that I thought the date was early, because I thought that the head had that sort of turning-the-corner forehead. But everybody else said the head was Hellenistic. Then they excavated the wreck, and the wreck

showed that indeed it had to be late fifth century. The wreck had actually happened in the late fifth century or the early fourth, so there was no way that that head could be Hellenistic. The Italians were so upset about this. I was asked to write an article on this for *The Art Bulletin*, and when I said that I would give that chronology they took back their request; they said they couldn't possibly accept that chronology. The article that was accepted by *The Art Bulletin* said there must have been another wreck superimposed on the earlier one.

Indeed, this was excavated scientifically; it wasn't a salvage excavation. They found a piece of drapery that joined a piece of drapery that had been taken from the wreck, so there was enough evidence to know when the wreck had taken place. So here was a case where new techniques corroborated a stylistic analysis, because of course all I had to go by was that photograph. There are still people who are a little bit uneasy about it. They tried to lower the date as much as they could, whereas I have stayed with my original date, because I think the comparison with the Parthenon metopes is really very strong. So there are some cases in which things can be proven later, with additional evidence. Just to do it purely on the basis of style might make me feel better, that I made the correct judgment, but I couldn't have proven it on my own in this case; it was something else that proved it. So, yes, sometimes problems get solved; it can happen.

LYONS: Did you know Gisela Richter?

RIDGWAY: Oh yes, I met her several times. She was a very lively woman. As a matter of fact, once I was going to do a book on korai, and she wrote me a letter and said, "Dear Mrs. Ridgway , Don't do it. I am doing it, so there is no point in your doing a book on korai." I also met her with Baldo [Baldassare] Conticello, because Miss Richter was the godmother of one of his children, and I went to see Sperlonga with them. (I knew Baldo from my student days in Greece.) After we had gone traipsing all over Sperlonga, as Baldo was driving back, she said, "Stop, stop, stop!" in the middle of the road, and he stopped. She had seen a potter's workshop, and she had to jump out and talk to the potter. We younger people were fairly dead tired, having had a whole day of driving and looking at Sperlonga. She was an indomitable woman; it was really something.

LYONS: And her observations of the sculptures at Sperlonga—did you have an exchange of ideas?

RIDGWAY: No, we were looking at the grotto and at all the fragments, but it wasn't so much a question of discussing the sculptures, although that was the first time I saw them; they are really very, very impressive.

SMITH: We wanted to begin today by discussing your responsibilities as editor of the *AJA*. How did you come to hold that position?

RIDGWAY: Well, they asked me, first of all. As usual, I never volunteer for anything. It was the committee. They approached me at one of the AIA meetings. I

had been involved in various capacities: I had been reading manuscripts, I had been reading articles for *AJA*, and I had been publishing my own books. They thought that maybe I would be a good person, so they asked me whether I wanted to do it. At first I was a little bit overwhelmed. As a non-native English speaker, I thought I would not be the ideal editor for something like this, but they said I could have an assistant editor who would help out with the prepositions, because that's the main problem when I write. I find that I can more readily criticize something that has been written by somebody else than something that has been written by me, so, in a way, I can do a fairly decent job of editing. Also, what was attractive was that they were saying I could take all the exchange periodicals, which of course I was going to give to the Bryn Mawr library.

So I went to the president of Bryn Mawr with this proposal and asked if I could do this, telling her we would get all the exchange periodicals, and so on, and the president said, "Yes, but you do it on your extra time; you cannot have a reduced load." There was a tradition, you see. Mary Swindler had been the editor of *AJA*, so it was like bringing it back home. I cared very much for the *AJA*, and I still do, because I think it is the one expression of American scholarship in Mediterranean archaeology, and it is a journal with very wide diffusion, so I think it is important that it is done right. To me it was also a point of principle: I knew that I was going to take on a lot more work. I also knew that my range was not that complete. The

assistant that I chose at that time to help me was Tamara Stech, a Bryn Mawr Ph.D. who had worked with Machteld Mellink. She had training in anthropology, but her field was really prehistory. We had enough overlap between the two fields: she had enough classical, and I had enough prehistory, so that we really worked very, very well together. Then eventually we added Alice A. Donohue, who had very good command of the English language and the editing, so we worked very well as a team.

The trouble with me is that I am a compulsive editor. Today I cannot read even a mystery story without marking mistakes in pencil, because I have done so much of it, it just comes as second nature. Moreover, if my name is on something, I have to have seen every stage of the work. What happened was that instead of having one person doing certain things and another doing something else, we ended up all doing the same things. So we all read and edited and proofread and did layout. As a result, we kept finding things that the other one had missed, so I thought that it was a very helpful process. After you have proofread galleys, then the pageproofs come, and you find things there that were put in in the middle of the night by the gremlins; everybody can tell you that. We had a graduate student studying in the department at the time, who drove us crazy. Every time a new issue of *AJA* came out, he would immediately come up to the third floor, where my office was, and say, "Mrs. Ridgway, on page such and such there is a typo". I could have killed the man because we had been so careful, even in blue line, trying to catch all the mistakes.

It was a lot of work, but it forced me to read things that normally I wouldn't have read. I think from this point of view it made me much more open. It made me realize that some people can have wonderful ideas and write them up abominably, so that you have to do a lot of work trying to rearrange or reorganize things for them. It made me realize how much of a message you can send with a journal, because you can to some extent shape the contents. We tried to have newsletters, and we tried to have issues that were dedicated to certain subjects. It came to my attention that nobody had ever done anything in honor of Richard Stillwell, who had been editor of *AJA* for years. So I decided to do an issue of the *AJA* in his honor. I tried to make it the kind of issue that would appeal to him. I dedicated the issue to him, and this was completely within my province. Of course, I very often had to report to the board of the Archaeological Institute, but there were certain things that I could do, and with something like that, people all agreed. Homer Thompson and Willy [William A. P.] Childs, at Princeton, went to present the special issue to Stillwell. He was very pleased.

So there are things that you can do with a journal that can be important. There are a lot of people who take *AJA* in this country who are not even archaeologists, and it's important that they see what the archaeologists are doing, but it is also *the* journal of the Archaeological Institute of America. It has to have some kind of validity abroad; it can't be overseen by just a figurehead, just a name that means nothing; it

has to be overseen by a scholar. If it had my name on it, I had to be responsible for everything that appeared in the journal. Sure, we made mistakes, but some of it was inexperience, obviously. We really didn't know how to do a journal. But we tried our best, and I think it is essential that the journal continues to be strong.

SMITH: What did you see as the special role of the journal vis-a-vis other archaeology or classical journals such as *Hesperia*?

RIDGWAY: Well, at that time, the *Journal of Field Archaeology* was not quite as prominent. But I did not want to have a journal, as some people were saying, that had purely excavation reports. That to me cut off a great part of archaeology. I also felt that it was important for the editor-in-chief to control the book reviews to some extent, even though there is a book review editor. I chose book review editors who were open to reviewing a little bit of everything, so that the reviews would also be representative of the scope of the journal.

I think Fred Kleiner has done a great job with the *American Journal of Archaeology*, but there are two areas I would have handled slightly differently. One, I would have kept the notes, because sometimes you can make a point in a very short note, but it doesn't lend itself to being inflated into an article. By cutting the short notes you have then eliminated that form of communication. That was Fred's editorial decision; you had to accept it. The other area was book reviews. His book review editors eliminated a lot of things. One of the editors is Stephen L. Dyson, who is very

interested in the theory of archaeology, provincial archaeology, and world archaeology, so he completely omits books on sculpture. My *Roman Copies* book was never reviewed by *AJA*. There was a book on sculpture by [Hellmut] Flashar that I wanted to review. Fred Kleiner had asked Steve to send me a copy, and he lost it. He was not interested; he probably passed it on to somebody because it was a book on sculpture and therefore he wasn't going to review it.

So those are the kinds of things that I would want to avoid. I think there ought to be complete coverage. We tried not to include Byzantine, because I had no expertise in that area, but eventually, with the newsletter from Anatolia, we did have one or two articles on Byzantine topics, and they were difficult for me to judge. You see, for the other articles, even though I also sent them to outside readers, I was already in a position to have some kind of an opinion, which made me feel better. Sometimes if I got two conflicting reviews—let's say that one was positive and the other one was negative—I always felt I knew enough that I could move it either one way or the other. But if I didn't have that kind of knowledge of the field, then my input or Tammy's input would have been negligible, and that's why I didn't feel comfortable with Byzantine.

You can't be everything to everybody. People said the *AJA* had turned into a journal of sculpture, and it certainly hadn't. When I gave up the editorship of *AJA*, I asked Tammy to make a calculation of the various categories of articles that we had

published, and I think that we had published more prehistory than anything else. So from this point of view people really had the wrong perception: Bruni Ridgway is the editor, of course it has to be a journal of sculpture. It wasn't.

SMITH: What was your relationship with the editorial board?

RIDGWAY: The editorial board really wasn't that influential. I reported to the board of the AIA. The configuration actually was a little bit different in those days. You didn't quite have the groups of various members the way you have now. I always presented figures and numbers, but people really gave me free rein. They did encourage me to do more anthropology. We started a newsletter that was written by an anthropologist which was very difficult to edit. That's where Tammy was invaluable, because she really had a lot of anthropology. She could edit some of the anthropological jargon so that it would be accessible to everybody. Otherwise, it was a very good newsletter. Some of the people who had clamored for it said they never read it, so, in a way, it didn't matter that much. But we even welcomed things on Egyptian and Mesopotamian topics, especially when they had some bearing. I really didn't want to exclude anything.

When John Humphrey wanted to start his own journal [*Journal of Roman Archaeology*], he came to see me. He asked to look at my log to see how many articles had been submitted on Roman topics, and how many we had rejected. Of course I opened the log to him, there was no reason not to. These logs are part of the

AIA archives. John Humphrey was surprised, because he thought that perhaps I had rejected quite a few Roman articles, but then when he saw the number of submissions, and those that had been accepted, he realized that if he wanted to do his journal, he had to go after the articles himself, because people don't necessarily submit in a certain field, and I think this is what he is doing.

This is why his review articles are also so important; John is getting articles out of people who otherwise wouldn't submit them by giving them reviews so that they express their opinion in article form on topics of Roman importance. The *JRA*, by the way, has become an excellent journal; I really think it is outstanding. I would love the *AJA* to be that strong. But John has nobody to answer to; he can really do what he wants. He has an editorial board, and he consults extensively, even now, but in the long run he is the one who decides, and I think it's a good idea. Also, it's limited to Roman archaeology, whereas the *AJA* is a little bit of everything. But I think it should be a little bit of everything.

SMITH: I noticed that you rejected about 30 percent of your submissions, so you accepted by far the large majority of what was submitted. Were these things that you were expecting to get, or were they requested articles?

RIDGWAY: I actually solicited very few. I solicited some articles when I wanted to make a special issue, but even the decision of making a special issue usually came when we already had several articles that seemed to fit a certain subject. But by and

large, no, I didn't solicit, because we had a backlog, you realize that. We felt a responsibility toward the people who had sent in articles. We didn't want them to sit forever, the way it had happened before.

SMITH: There seem to be several political issues that have to do with not only the journal but the AIA's general stance. First is this issue of the newsletters. I noticed a couple of editorial statements or comments where you were trying to find out if the newsletters were in fact useful to people. Was there criticism, or was there a demand for newsletters?

RIDGWAY: Yes. I think everybody agreed that the newsletter from Anatolia was important, but for the others there were people who were in favor and there were people who were against. Many people who did not get the *BCH* [*Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique*], or the *JHS* [*Journal of Hellenic Studies*] felt that an *AJA* newsletter from Greece would have been a wonderful help, but it was so difficult to find a person in Greece who was willing to write that newsletter. A newsletter like that takes a lot of effort. Then, when somebody proposed to us this newsletter from the Holy Land, or Jordan, we called something Palestine and we were attacked very violently by a friend of mine who said we had done something horrible to Israel. We were just thinking in geographical terms: it was Palestine, and it was B.C.; I am not involved with today's politics. So there was a debate going on on that for a while, but then it calmed down. But it was mostly a question of letters to the editor. Somebody

volunteered a newsletter from Jordan, but that only lasted a short time. I see that now they have picked up other newsletters. Some people really thought that *AJA* should not be concerned with that. That again is a matter of opinion, but more than opinion, it's a matter of availability, because not many people can produce a newsletter.

SMITH: The question of excavation reports also seems to be something that came up.

RIDGWAY: I was certainly very willing to have excavation reports; I think that is part of the task of *AJA*. As a matter of fact, I thought that in some cases, when people were so reluctant to come out with a final publication, and our own Machteld Mellink is an example, it was essential to have those reports, because they are real documentation. What I didn't want was reports by people who found five stones here and three stones there, and didn't know what they had. What I wanted was a substantive excavation report; that would have had priority, no question.

SMITH: But did you have difficulties with people who wanted to give what you call a trench-by-trench excavation report instead of an analytic report?

RIDGWAY: No, because actually this was really a theoretical discussion; it never came to that point. There was a great deal of discussion, but in terms of actual submission I never had to turn down an excavation report. I never had the kind of excavation report that I felt I couldn't publish.

LYONS: Were these reports limited to American excavations?

RIDGWAY: Yes, because it's the *American Journal of Archaeology*. If it had been a collaborative excavation that would also have been possible. I actually went after the person who was doing Naukratis, because we hadn't heard a word about that. Naukratis was important from the American point of view as well as the Egyptian and Greek points of view; it was a Greek colony. So I went after those people to give me a report on their excavation.

SMITH: Did they?

RIDGWAY: Yes, oh yes. And Morgantina. There hadn't been any reports on Morgantina for a long time, so I resumed that with the Stillwell issue. Despite the fact that I personally don't like to do it, I know how essential fieldwork is to archaeology; there is no question.

SMITH: Then there's this major issue of refusing to publish articles that are based on illegal excavation and trade. You seem to raise that issue enough that there must have been some difficulty with people trying to sneak around that policy?

RIDGWAY: I should say, first of all, that I was "brought up" by Machteld Mellink, and she feels very strongly about this. I couldn't agree with her more. I completely agree that if you take an object out of context you have lost one of the most important contributions of the object. I don't go for the object as such; I go for the object as a signifier of the past. So from this point of view I need the context. The

Porticello Head is a very good example. If it had been found out of context, I wouldn't have been able to convince anyone that it was early. Everybody would have said "Hellenistic," but when they excavated the context they finally had to give in. So, from this point of view, I couldn't have agreed more.

Also, at that time, the Archaeological Institute was trying to formulate principles of fairness. I disagreed with Machteld Mellink's belief that any object with an uncertain provenance should not be accepted as first publication, regardless of when it was acquired. I thought that if we had passed a resolution in a certain year (1972), we had to take that year as the official cut-off date; therefore, anything acquired before that year could be allowed publication. After that year, we could have said, "We have told everybody, we have made an official statement, we really abide by what we said." That I thought was very important. I also thought that we were being very lenient, because what we objected to was first publication; it wasn't references to something that had been mentioned elsewhwere. I didn't have any major conflict with this policy, but we had endless discussions. People were calling me, but because they knew my position, they probably didn't even submit the article.

SMITH: So you didn't have people trying to sneak around?

RIDGWAY: No. I know that some objects were mentioned in articles that I published that were past the date of the resolution, but they were not the first publication, and I checked on that very carefully. You know, once Dietrich von

Bothmer wrote me this letter because he was very indignant about this policy, and he said, "Even in our society today we accept illegitimate children." I wrote back, "But we still prosecute for rape!" [laughter] So we left it at that.

LYONS: Were you the editor at the time when he had the big conflict with the AIA concerning the Metropolitan Museum's acquisition of the Euphronios krater?

RIDGWAY: No, it was much earlier. He was actually coming up for membership to the board, or whatever it was, and he was denied on the basis of questions about that acquisition. I was not on the board at that time. I was at the large AIA meeting, but not in any official capacity. Von Bothmer was very upset by that. I don't think he has ever forgiven the AIA.

LYONS: Did you get letters from museum curators who would try and convince you that these objects had more importance in and of themselves?

RIDGWAY: No, they didn't try. I received a lot of telephone calls, but because people wanted me to look at objects, and I would say, "No I am not going to look at them. I am not going to give you an opinion." Even people whom I knew fairly well, who wanted me to do this on the basis of friendship: "Bruni, would you give your opinion for this friend of mine?" I would say, "No, I will not. Only if you can tell me where the object came from." Actually, Jirí Frel showed me [Ernst] Langlotz's letter regarding the Getty Kouros. Of course the signature looked like Langlotz's, because I had gotten a letter from him myself, but I found out afterwards it was forged. Even

so, at the time I wouldn't pass judgment on the kouros before the Getty had bought it. I wouldn't even look at it.

LYONS: Did you advise other museums?

RIDGWAY: I did not advise, but I gave my opinion if the object had some kind of pedigree, if the object really was known before 1972, when we made the official statement.

SMITH: I know you also tried to apply this policy, to the degree that you could, in the book reviews section.

RIDGWAY: Yes.

SMITH: How practical was that, to be able to monitor?

RIDGWAY: That I wouldn't know so much, because there was a book review editor; some of these decisions were made in collaboration. One of the editors was Karen D. Vitelli, and she was actually at the avant-garde on this issue; she was even stronger than I was. The first book review editor was Pat [Patricia Neils] Boulter, whom I inherited, and then it was Karen Vitelli, and then we had Warren [G.] Moon.

SMITH: And Vitelli also did a series on the antiquities market?

RIDGWAY: Yes. She has done this for the AIA in general; she has made statements on the moral position of the AIA.

SMITH: Do you think the AIA is doing enough on this issue, or does more need to be done?

RIDGWAY: Not enough, because there are some people who are still convinced that acquisition of objects with questionable provenances should be permissible. And these are people who are really respected scholars. I can understand some of what they are saying. For instance, in Italy, they told me personally that they only cataloged whole lamps at an excavation, and they were finding thousands of them, so after a while they would begin to step on the lamps so that they wouldn't be forced to catalog any more of them! Okay, why can't these things be put on the market and made accessible to places that have absolutely no antiquities, where they could show them in their museums, where they could use them for teaching facilities? What really hits the market are the masterpieces, and those no country would give up.

I thought that the statement of the Getty was ridiculous, I'm sorry to say. If the country doesn't claim it, it's all right to purchase a questionable object. The country can only claim it if the object has been stolen and there is a record of it, but if it is something that has been excavated illicitly the country would never know. My father was in the Guardia di Finanza, and the Guardia di Finanza bulletin that he received had pictures of all these objects that had been confiscated from the *tombaroli*, but it also had the obituaries of the Guardie di Finanza who had been killed by the *tombaroli* when they were trying to prevent the illicit digging of a tomb. I, in a way, was predisposed to this position because I knew how dangerous it was. I don't want to begrudge it to the poor people who have no money, but usually the peasant

who finds antiquities in his backyard doesn't make any money anyway. It has become a major enterprise, because the illicit antiquities go to Switzerland, and other people make piles of money. Turkey, Greece . . . there is a lot of this going on. You have to educate people, and you have to educate the collectors here.

I was asked to give an opinion on the statue that was owned partly by [Leon] Levy and partly by the Boston Museum of Fine Arts—the lower half of the statue was in Turkey; it was part of an excavation. They wanted an impartial person, and I was considered impartial enough. Cornelius Vermeule and Carlos Picón were not considered impartial, because they were museum curators. I was supposed to be there when they put together casts of the two halves—the one that was in Turkey, and the other one that was in Boston. I was prepared to really speak my mind and say what it was. I didn't have to open my mouth. The moment the two pieces were put together they clicked; you didn't even have to put scotch tape, and we were all prepared to put supports and clay. The two pieces went together so well that we stood by and just photographed it; they were so obviously the two halves of the same work. Have they returned the Boston half to Turkey? No. I think that that is irresponsible, and I think that that should be stamped out, absolutely. I've said that to the Getty, I've said it to John Walsh, I have said it to everybody.

SMITH: Did you discuss this with Cornelius Vermeule at the time?

RIDGWAY: To some extent, but there was no need to discuss anything. What could

you do? He didn't have the nerve to say anything else. Every now and then he publishes lists of works in this country and where they came from. I remember when he gave a major talk at the AIA on the Boubon bronzes that were in this country. How could he know that they were all from Boubon? At that time even the Turks didn't know it. So there is a basic conflict between museum people, who obviously want the objects for their museums, and the archaeologist who excavates and wants to save the context.

I think museums should realize that they already have more than enough, that they can do something with the old collections. This is why I was so pleased when Carlos bought the Hope Dionysos and restored it; it's a glorious statue. That was in the Hope Collection in England, and it had been very poorly restored; it was falling apart. Now it's a glory, it is so beautiful. Get something like that; that really contributes, but don't buy anything on the illicit market. [Carlos] has been known now to return things— things that were there before, not purchased by him. I think Turkey won one lawsuit.

LYONS: But he was your student, so how do you reconcile your position with the fact that he isn't—

RIDGWAY: Oh, I preach to him all the time, and according to what he tells me, he is above board. Whether he is or isn't I don't know, because I am not in that world. In England, for instance, students are trained to go to dealers specifically, see what they

have, and establish contact with them. These are the students, these are not the museum curators. Dealers put out catalogs that are even cited in publications because you can get important examples of things that are not known otherwise. We don't do that here, or at least we don't do it in certain places. I think people have given up on numismatists, for instance, because coins are so easily tradable you cannot demonstrate that any coin comes from a particular location; you cannot do it. A hoard is already out of context to begin with, and yet the integrity of a hoard is enormously important in order to find the time of currency of certain issues.

Unfortunately, there are a lot of archaeologists that have this kind of mentality: "It's important for me to have this in our museum." I used to be a friend of Jirí Frel, and that was a friendship that went a long time back. When I was at the Louvre studying the Piombino Apollo, people wouldn't give me the time of day because they didn't want to have the statue declared late; they wanted it to be archaic. Frel was there because he was studying his own stelai, and he made sure that I had access to whatever there was in the archives on the Piombino Apollo, which was very little. He really befriended me, and he wasn't asking anything of me. At that time I was completely unknown.

The one thing that he eventually asked for was publications; he wanted to trade books. He said, "I'll give you publications of my country, but let me have Richter's *Portraits*, for instance, because in my country we cannot get publications."

That to me was such a decent thing to do; he really was interested in getting publications. I always saw him at the level of the researcher. I thought he had a great eye. He was *pazzoide* . . . wait a minute, that's an Italian word. What would it be in English? *pazzoide* . . . meaning not really crazy, but extravagant. He was . . . bananas. [laughter] That kind of thing, you know. But I thought that he really was a scholar.

Another thing that endeared Frel to me. When I went to visit the Getty once, he started discussing things with me about a statue. There was a guard there who was listening, so Frel immediately grabbed him and explained what we were discussing. I thought, "This is really what I want to do; it's an extension of teaching." He was really interested in telling the guard why this was important. The guard was probably listening because he was bored stiff and he didn't have anything else to do, but Frel was teaching. I thought, "This is what a museum should be." Frel said he was trying to get an object from each period so that then when the students came he could really show them what the various periods were. Then to find out that he had embezzled funds; that to me was a terrible blow, because I thought he was an idealistic person. That was a rude awakening: I had seen a side of him that I had liked. I don't know that he deliberately bought a forgery, but on the other hand, he really had a very good eye, so how could he have bought that relief which I could tell was a forgery? I don't know.

LYONS: Did you have relationships with any of the subsequent curators: Arthur Houghton, or Marion True?

RIDGWAY: No; of course, I know Marion True. You know my relationship with the Getty. They invited me to give a talk at one of their symposia, but otherwise I haven't done anything else with them. Other than Carlos, who was my student, I really don't know museum people. I knew Kurt Luckner, because he took me around the Toledo Museum and talked to me about the glass. He was so enthusiastic, and it was just a question of my visiting the museum at that time. Who else did I know? I don't think I really know museum curators. Arielle Kozloff, briefly, because she is the sister-in-law of a student of mine, so sometimes the connection is completely different.

SMITH: What are your favorite museums?

RIDGWAY: You mean in this country or abroad?

SMITH: Anywhere.

RIDGWAY: Of course, Athens, the Acropolis Museum: I go ecstatic when I am in Athens. Or the National Museum in Athens. But any museum that has Greek antiquities I very much enjoy. I think the Metropolitan is a wonderful museum. I think the Boston Museum of Fine Arts is fantastic. I worry about the objects when they are in this country. When I am abroad . . . the Pergamon Museum. We were in Berlin two weeks ago, and it's just a pleasure to go to any museum there; I am

completely entrapped.

But it's a shame to divorce the objects from their context. For instance, I have done a lot of work on architectural sculpture, and you learn so much more when it is within the architectural frame, because all of a sudden you see things that you wouldn't otherwise. The metopes from Olympia with the Athena that supports the heavens . . . but she's also supporting the entablature, she's also supporting the cornice. Or a Herakles that is forcing the triglyph. He's *really* forcing the triglyph; you have the impression that he is going to remove a very substantial piece of masonry. When you see them in context, when you see, for instance, the three figures that go right in harmony with the three glyphs, you can see the rhythm. I think architectural sculpture has to be seen that way. The frieze of the Hephaisteion, with the gods sitting over the antae, which I think is perfect, or Peter Grunauer's studies on the Olympia pediments, how the figures are placed in relationship to the columns. I think we should do more of that; we should put architectural sculpture in an architectural frame.

LYONS: What do you think of private collections on display, such as the [Leon] Levy/ [Shelby] White collection, which you mentioned, or the Fleischman collection? Do you think there's a positive role that the private collector can play?

RIDGWAY: No, absolutely. I wish they wouldn't do it. I have never seen these private collections as private collections. I saw the Levy/White collection when it

was at the Metropolitan, for instance, and it was on display with objects from the Metropolitan. When I was in California Frel took me to somebody's house, and believe it or not I couldn't even tell you the name of the man, because I have forgotten, but he had a most spectacular Hellenistic statue. Frel was cultivating him because he was hoping he would give it to the Getty Museum. But I have not seen it in your museum yet; it was a female figure with sort of very fluctuating drapery. This was a man who lived on the sea side of the highway, but I don't know who he was. The names go right out of my head, because I am not interested in collectors, I don't want to know about them. This might even be Freudian amnesia; I just don't want to know about them.

SMITH: So collectors don't call you up from time to time asking for your advice?

RIDGWAY: No, they most certainly don't, because they know not to by now. As I have said, there are some people who have called me, respectable archaeologists, who were using their friendship to say, "Would you give me an opinion on this?" And I would say no. Unless, as I said, it cleared specific issues. Then I would say whatever I thought, of course.

SMITH: Another issue that seemed to come up while you were editor of *AJA* was the question of starting to publish new world archaeology on some kind of exchange basis. How did that develop and did it lead anywhere that was productive?

RIDGWAY: It developed because there was a great interest among members of the

AIA. I felt that I could not control that field, but because Tammy could, I thought maybe it would be all right. So we did accept this idea of a newsletter being published, and the person was not only a respectable scholar but really a good person. He was not pushing a particular point of view, he was not ramming it down our throats saying, "This is the way to do archaeology." On the contrary, I was so surprised by how critical he was of certain positions in anthropological archaeology, pointing out that some theory no longer held, or that the fallacy of a certain theory had been demonstrated. But it didn't seem to go very far in terms of the readership.

[Tape V, Side Two]

SMITH: Another thing that happened while you were editor is that you started getting support from the Getty Trust. Were you involved in developing that?

RIDGWAY: Ah, yes. We thought first of all that it would have been very nice to have a special centennial issue that attracted attention. We had a glossy cover, for instance, that was very attractive, and that everybody immediately recognized. We couldn't have done that with the resources we had. At one point we published some articles that would have really benefited from color plates. Color plates are very expensive; you really have to go out and get the money for that, and that is something that I wish the *AJA* would do. Also, I have always felt uneasy about the quality of the plates. I paid enormous attention to that. We had a press, the Science Press, that I felt very comfortable with because it was a profit-sharing organization; it was

Pennsylvania Dutch and it was in Pennsylvania Dutch country, so that the people of the press were actually benefiting from a good product; it was more than just a commercial enterprise. The agent was wonderful; he would come around and take us to the plant, and we would see everything, and he would make suggestions to us. So I thought the Science Press was very good, and they really tried their best with plates. I was sorry in a way that the new editorship of the *AJA* dropped the Science Press, but I think they are doing fine anyway, I have no objection.

SMITH: [to Lyons:] Do you have any questions about the AIA, I mean, Bruni's involvement in it, or any questions you might have about the history of the organization?

LYONS: We should talk about the AIA.

RIDGWAY: I have tried to distance myself now from the AIA, first of all, because as editor of *AJA* I had to attend all the meetings, and I had an overdose of that. Afterwards, I agreed to be on the Committee on Publications again. I had always been on the Committee on Publications, and this issue of the AIA monographs to me was a sore spot, because we made all these promises about publishing manuscripts and then they were never published. So I was sort of burned from that experience, and yet I agreed to do it again. I ended up by doing a lot of work on things that really didn't go through. I really felt that there was no point in my wasting my time on something like this; I've been a little bit discouraged by the AIA.

Also, it's expensive for me to go to meetings. You do know that when I was the editor of *AJA* I was not being paid at all, but they refunded my expenses, so that if I went to a meeting at least I didn't pay out of my pocket. Now it would be completely out of my pocket. Why spend all that money? The AIA meetings have become enormous, and the papers are scheduled in such a way that I would be forced to run desperately from one session to another. Many of them are concomitant and therefore I cannot hear some of my own students, which is what I would like to hear. I really don't feel that there is any purpose to be served by my going to the meetings. When I was the editor of *AJA*, yes, I think it was important, because lots of people approached me there saying, "Would you be interested in such an article?" And I would say yes, and then they would end up by sending it. I thought that that was an important service that I had to give. But now I don't think it serves any purpose.

I am very pleased that the *AJA* publishes the abstracts of the papers given at the annual meetings, even though they print them ahead of time. That was one of the things that I reinstituted, because when I took the *AJA* they weren't doing it anymore. I think it's essential, because this really gives people an idea of what is being discussed at AIA meetings. The trouble of course with the abstracts is that now they have asked for them so early that by the time the paper is presented the author might have made changes. I think that this is a bad policy, to ask for the abstracts way ahead of time. I don't think that you can think that much ahead of time; I know I would have

never given one of my papers if I had had to submit it so far ahead of time. So I haven't given an AIA paper for I don't know how long.

LYONS: Are there any directions that you feel that either the journal or the AIA should be going into?

RIDGWAY: Well, I think any direction is valid as long as it doesn't exclude any other. This is what worries me: that usually there is a bandwagon, and people tend to use one form to the detriment of all the others. I really want to see a little bit of everything. One thing that I don't like to see in the *AJA*, and I've seen it in one or two articles, is a sort of gossipy approach: "So-and-so thought that this person bought a forgery, or the other one was promoting forgeries . . . " That kind of thing doesn't interest me at all. Historiography is fine, but not this kind of interpersonal animosity; that turns me off.

SMITH: But isn't the issue of forgery so central to archaeology?

RIDGWAY: Absolutely, absolutely. I don't object to articles on forgeries, I object to articles that condemn individuals. Not the forgers, but the scholars. [to Lyons:] You know the article I am referring to; it was about British archaeologists, moreover, so it wasn't anything that touched me personally. It was Alan Wace and Winifred Lamb, I think.

LYONS: Oh, yes.

RIDGWAY: And I didn't like that at all.

SMITH: But if a scholar's personal life has been involved with forgery, doesn't that taint that scholar's work, then? So that it's not irrelevant—

RIDGWAY: It depends how it is done. If it is done with the intent of saying, "Beware of this work because these were the circumstances in which the work surfaced," yes, but if it is done to minimize the value of the scholar, no. That bothers me. Because one has to assume that we all try our best. I can't imagine a scholar deliberately setting out to mislead. I'm sure there are those types. But then expose the object, not necessarily the person.

SMITH: There are scholars who seem to have done that, and then there are no doubt curators who buy things that are not only illegal, but perhaps they also know that they are forgeries.

RIDGWAY: I don't know, I don't know. If you have absolutely clear evidence, then it makes much more sense to have it not in an *AJA* article but in some kind of monograph. You know, I don't even like Bill [William M.] Calder's work on [Heinrich] Schliemann, because there is an imbalance there, too. Okay, this might be a personal reaction, but this is my reaction. I don't like when this is done to scholars. So that kind of thing I wouldn't like so much in *AJA*. Historiography, yes. [to Lyons:] You know the article that Alice Donohue wrote on [Johann Joachim] Winckelmann (in W. G. Moon, ed., *Polykleitos, the Doryphoros, and Tradition*). I think that's a superb article. It is not taking Winckelmann down; on the contrary, it's

just pointing out where he was coming from and how he conceived things. That is completely valid and very important.

LYONS: The one in *AJA* was a critical article that analyzed the whole basis for the study of Minoan figurines.

RIDGWAY: Right, no that's valid, that's valid, yes.

LYONS: But it was very critical also of the scholar who had established the stylistic categories—

RIDGWAY: Sure, but that at least is critical as theory. I criticize the theory of Gisela Richter, but I am in admiration of Gisela Richter. If she hadn't done what she had done with the kouroi, we couldn't have done what we are doing now. Even though I don't think her method is really sound now, in the light of our knowledge today, the fact is that she made an enormous contribution. Maybe you have to organize something a certain way before people can look at it and say, "No, this is not the right way, let's do it another way." Points of principle, points of theory, debate over ideas, yes. It's the personalities that I don't want to have involved, because that I don't think has a place in an archaeological journal.

I don't like to see book reviews that cut a person down too much either, or that only point out the negative, not the positive things. In my seminars I very often now have taken to assigning one book that everybody can read because it's pertinent, and I ask the students to write a book review so that I can criticize it, because usually

the first thing that a young scholar may publish is a book review. If nobody has ever told you how to write a book review, you can fall into the trap of trying to make your own points, trying to score, and you don't realize that you endanger yourself by scoring too much, and that a book review, in order to be a proper review, has to point out what is good about a book as well as what is bad, or what you think is not correct. It is a problem of ideas, it's not a problem of "that idiot" who said such and such. I don't know. I hope my work has lived up to this kind of principle. I hope you find in my own writings that that's what I've done.

SMITH: I'd like to move on to discussing some of your students and your relationship with them. It seems like you've had many of them.

RIDGWAY: Yes, a lot, a lot. And some were not Bryn Mawr students. I met students on the archaeological tours that I did for the AIA, and there were Penn students, and students from the American School in Athens. When I was at the School as [Elizabeth] Whitehead Visiting Professor, in '88, Ken [Kenneth Shapiro] Lapatin was there. I have written a million recommendations for him, and he wasn't even my student, I just met him there. So I seem to establish this kind of relationship all too quickly, but I enjoy that, I think that that is part and parcel of teaching. I keep in touch with the students. I see them as individuals, not just as somebody who is there paying his or her money, getting their piece of paper and then that's it, they are gone. To me they continue to be important, particularly those who remain in the

field; I want to see what they are doing.

SMITH: Your first Ph.D. was Nancy Bookidis.

RIDGWAY: Yes, I am very proud of her, I think she is tremendous. I was very disappointed that she didn't publish her dissertation on the distribution of Archaic architectural sculpture, and that I really have to put at the door of Machteld Mellink, because at that defense, Machteld Mellink said, "But in order for this survey to be really probative, you should have included the akroteria." Nancy really took this as a major criticism. It seemed to me that the akroteria were so very difficult to pin down, and she had already done an enormous amount of work; she couldn't possibly have done anything else, and it really wasn't that important. She wasn't trying to establish programs for each building, she was trying to establish preferences in the forms of sculptural decoration. But because I was young and Machteld was a figure of awe, I think Nancy went with Machteld's criticism, and never had the nerve to publish her dissertation.

So when I wrote *The Archaic Style*, I made it a point to say that all of the ideas on architectural sculpture were based on Nancy Bookidis's work. Even when I disagreed with her. I had given her that topic, I had been working on it, and I was going to write a book on it. But it didn't matter, because her book would have been far better than mine, probably, because she really went from site to site, and she collected a lot of evidence. She had the kind of approach that probably I wouldn't

have had the patience to pursue. It was an excellent dissertation and I wanted people to realize it, and I think that brought it to people's attention. Nancy wrote me a letter and she said, "I don't know whether I ought to thank you or kill you." [laughter] In any case, now everybody knows her book in microfilm. I always try to cite my students' articles if I can, even those that are forthcoming—and sometimes they are not forthcoming! I always try to give credit to the students, because I think it's important to encourage them.

SMITH: Nancy Winter was another early student of yours.

RIDGWAY: Yes, but Nancy Winter is a special case. Again, if we are talking in confidence here, I might mention this: she deliberately took the M.A. with me because she said she wanted to do her Ph.D. with Kyle, and she knew that Kyle would not supervise closely, and she needed to learn, so she wanted to do the M.A. with me. I said fine, and that's what we did. So she knew all along that her real interest was somewhere else. But she did a good job, she wrote on a statuette, the Benghazi Venus, which is at the University of Pennsylvania Museum. Donald White just asked her for permission to read her M.A., and I Xeroxed it and gave it to him. He has a different idea on this topic, and he was going to present it as a paper. He was quite impressed with her M.A. M.A.s we don't circulate unless we have the permission of the student, because an M.A. is not an official document like a Ph.D. A Ph.D. has to meet publication standards; it is public record, and its distribution is

not controlled by the student, unless the student puts a copyright on it. For the M.A., no; you have to ask permission.

SMITH: Another one of your Ph.D. students who has since become a colleague of yours is Stella Miller.

RIDGWAY: Yes, yes. She was a very independent student, I must say, because she was working on Macedonian architecture, and she did this mostly in Greece. She worked a lot with Lucy Shoe there, because she was concerned with moldings, and there was a slight problem because she was doing a section on painting, and Kyle didn't pass it, so he made her rewrite that. Whether it was really because the section wasn't good enough, or whether it was because there was some kind of latent hostility about the fact that it wasn't his dissertation, I have no way of knowing. But eventually it did pass.

SMITH: So she rewrote it to his satisfaction?

RIDGWAY: That one section, yes. And it has become a major contribution. She has continued in the field, and she is now the Macedonian expert, let's say, from the archaeological point of view, in this country. Eugene Borza is a historian in that area who is very well known, but in the field of archaeology I think Stella undoubtedly is the Macedonian expert now.

SMITH: Were you involved in her being hired onto the Bryn Mawr faculty?

RIDGWAY: No. As a matter of fact, the whole process of hiring this time was, I

might say quite openly, very painful to me, because it seems that they deliberately didn't ask my opinion and deliberately didn't let me know. When they had the short list, the people at the American School in Athens wrote to me about it. I heard it from them. I was in Bryn Mawr and nobody told me about it. So I was a little bit hurt by that, that they wouldn't even tell me when everybody else was already told. I've mentioned it already; it seemed that whenever I recommended somebody it was like being typhoid Mary; they automatically disqualified the person. I particularly wanted Mark Fullerton, and I still think that he is superb. I wanted someone to continue the sculpture tradition.

I think very highly of Alice Donohue, I think she has a superb mind, but she is not what I would consider a sculpture person. I was hoping that since we have a superior sculpture library, and we are one of the very few places in the United States where you can really do sculpture, that we could have continued. With Stella, there was no question: I would have said, "Fine; that is something I agree with wholeheartedly." Alice, from the point of view of intelligence and general knowledge, is fine, sure, but I would have wanted a sculpture person. So this is not against Alice; it's just that I would have liked to have continued the sculpture tradition. But I'm sure she's doing very well.

SMITH: Another former student of yours who has also become a colleague is James Wright.

RIDGWAY: Yes. He was my former student, up to a point. Here I have to say he was much more Kyle's student. Even though he wrote his dissertation with Machteld, Kyle was the one who promoted him. He started as an undergraduate at Haverford, and he was a philosophy major, so archaeology was really a sideline with him, and then Kyle encouraged him to continue in archaeology at Bryn Mawr. I think we took him on Kyle's recommendation, because he wasn't that strong as an undergraduate. But it wasn't his major, so that wasn't even his fault. Then he went to Vietnam; he had to be in the service there. He wrote his M.A. with me. I had a lot of struggle trying to get him to shape that M.A. as I wanted it. I was afraid to walk around in the streets in case he decided he was going to throttle me, because I really was giving him a hard time. [laughter] But eventually he really saw the light, and he scrapped whatever he had done and did it again, and did a very successful job; it was on Greek sarcophagi. But his main interest was prehistory. He then did his dissertation with Machteld Mellink and she was the one who particularly favored his appointment at Bryn Mawr. He is now the dean of the graduate school.

SMITH: Isn't it unusual in most schools for former students to come back and join the faculty?

RIDGWAY: I thought it was, and actually I thought we really tried very hard not to bring back our own students, but in the case of Jim, Machteld Mellink's argument was that he had spent so many years at the school in Athens that he really had achieved a

completely different perspective; he had been the secretary of the American School for something like five years, so he was no longer just a Bryn Mawr product. He was not a Bryn Mawr undergraduate, and he had not majored in archaeology; he had only taken some courses in archaeology. So she thought that this was enough guarantee that he had a different outlook. For Stella, she had been all over the map before she came back to Bryn Mawr. Alice was an undergraduate at Bryn Mawr, but then she got an M.A. from Princeton, and a Ph.D. from the Institute of Fine Arts in New York. She had been an editor for the American School of Classical Studies, she had been at CASVA, she had a variety of teaching positions, for instance, at Drexel, and she had taught at Penn in the art history department. She wasn't really a Bryn Mawr student; she was only an undergraduate at Bryn Mawr.

So these are people who have a loyalty and an understanding of Bryn Mawr, but they are not stamped by Bryn Mawr. For instance, when people think of Alice as "following in my footsteps," it is by no means the case. Alice has a completely different training. Even when she was working with me at the *AJA* it wasn't that kind of thing. I wasn't teaching her. I didn't even read her dissertation until it was finished. I didn't want the people at NYU to think that I was meddling, because she was having a lot of trouble with her supervisor.

SMITH: You mentioned Mark Fullerton. How did his dissertation topic develop?

RIDGWAY: Well, again, that was one topic that was of great interest to me. He

was very good in sculpture, and he went to Athens where he really could do this. Of course, even if I suggest a topic, it has to respond to something in the student, and that was the case with Mark. I am delighted to see how far he has gone. His book is completely different from his dissertation. He started by publishing articles from the dissertation so that then the book could really concentrate on the Roman period. His topic was archaistic sculpture in the round, but he has passed me by by a mile now in terms of theory.

SMITH: Another student of yours whom you cite quite a bit is Kim [J.]Hartswick.

RIDGWAY: Yes, yes. Oh, I like Kim very much. I get very involved with the students. I knew Kim's first wife, I know his second wife. Once I get to know the students, I really know the students. Mark Fullerton's two children are very close in age to my grandchildren, so we compare notes: what is yours doing, and so on. All my students, I hope, are my friends. Kim took to sculpture wonderfully. He even trained as an artist, and he is a very good draughtsman. He has a special knowledge of photography. Actually, Henry Robinson (professor at Case Western Reserve and former excavator at Corinth while director of the American School in Athens) tutored him in the classical languages. Of course when he came to Bryn Mawr he was very interested in sculpture, and we worked together. Then when I had to be on sabbatical, I had to be away from Bryn Mawr, I suggested Kim as my replacement, and the students loved him, they really liked him very much.

Actually, he wasn't the first person who came to replace me or Gloria. At first we tried to get somebody who was completely separate from Bryn Mawr, and that person was not a success at all, for a variety of reasons that I don't want to go into, but the second time I really put my foot down and said to Gloria, "Why are we casting around for people whom we don't really know, when we have people that we do know, that know us, and that therefore would work very well? This is not a permanent appointment." Kim was a great success, the students loved him. As a matter of fact, at the time of the search they even petitioned to have him appointed, which of course immediately turned the committee off. I don't know why.

SMITH: Susan Kane is another of your Ph.D.s.

RIDGWAY: You know, something funny happened with Susan Kane. She wrote one of these book reviews that I disagreed with, and I told her so in no uncertain terms, and I think that she has been upset with me ever since. She was quite attached to me, and when she finished her book for the University of Pennsylvania Museum on the Cyrene sculpture, she gave me the manuscript to review. At that time I was at CASVA, and it really killed me, going over all that material, but I went over it very faithfully for her. I always read what the students send me, and they do send me a lot of things, let me tell you. I always end up by doing three times the amount of work that I should be doing because everybody sends me these things. I understand that now the book should be out. She has also moved into the direction of marble studies,

which is great. I think she is involved now with Norman Herz in a study of stones in antiquity.

My contacts with her have loosened up a bit. I criticized her review, not to say, "Oh, how awful of you." I wanted to say to her, "You are damaging yourself, don't do it. You need to point out things that are good about something." She was saying this person didn't measure the statues and didn't set sizes, because she herself was interested in this aspect of sculture, but the fact that Susan is interested in this does not mean that it is an absolute requirement. Yes, you can point it out, "it would have been desirable," but there are ways of saying things. So I sent her a note, because I felt it was my responsibility. I never give up on a student. Once my student, unfortunately, the poor people, always my student. I think she took it badly, and I'm sorry. But when we see each other we are very friendly.

SMITH: I know you write recommendation letters, but do you keep your eyes open for jobs that are coming up?

RIDGWAY: Oh yes. Or I suggest people when they ask me. Surely, of course.

SMITH: So you might call up a student and say, "There's going to be a job opening up at this university, you should apply for it"?

RIDGWAY: Yes, and sometimes I call up the university and say, "Can I recommend so-and-so?" You have to do that, it's such a terrible situation out there. By now I think probably people will forget about me, because not being a member of the faculty

at Bryn Mawr anymore, I won't have the punch. And it will also be a finite number of students. I recommend now people that I taught twenty-five years ago, I still do, especially those that have remained in the field, but more on the level of colleagues, fellow scholars. But there are very few of my students now that are still in the run.

Some of them, unfortunately, have gone into contract archaeology. I'm not saying unfortunately because I don't think that that is worthwhile, it's because I think that they were very good and would have made major contributions. Michael Hornum wrote a dissertation on the cult of Nemesis and it was published as a book immediately, and yet he couldn't find a job. He was teaching at Pittsburgh for a while, and they loved him there, but they never could find a slot for him, so he went into contract archaeology, which is really a shame. I have a few more Ph.D. students, still working under my supervision, you know.

SMITH: Okay, go on.

RIDGWAY: Angeliki Kosmopoulou has finished, and we hope that we can defend now for Anne Marie Knoblauch, and then there are three more that are going to come up.

LYONS: Of all of your students, not only the ones at Bryn Mawr, but maybe even ones that you've mentored from other places, are there some who particularly stand out in your mind for their work and their achievements?

RIDGWAY: Oh surely; for instance, Mary [C.] Sturgeon. I'm very proud of her.

And Harriet Anne Weis. They were both here in Florida, at the fourth Langford conference, they both gave terrific papers, and I was as proud as punch. It makes me feel very happy when I see my students doing so well. The one that I still have enormous regrets about is George Szeliga, because I thought he had one of the best minds I ever taught. Now they can't even find him, he has completely dropped out. I think he was very bitter toward Bryn Mawr, and, unfortunately, I think it was Massenzia that did it.

For his M.A. I said to him, "Oh this is not a valid topic." He said, "No, I want to do it." He did it, and it was great. I said to him, "Publish it." He didn't publish it. Now that I am doing the Sather Lectures, I am quoting him, saying, "This was his theory," and so on, and so on. He made something wonderful out of his Ph.D. dissertation, which was on another topic that I didn't think was very strong. He never published it as a book, but because it is on microfilm, it has been cited by several people. His theory of course is now completely accepted, that the akroterial figures that you have on Sicilian temples, riding horses, must be the Dioskouroi; there has been more evidence brought to bear. He even gave two papers at the AIA and published two articles in *AJA*, but he has dropped out of sight completely.

He was of Polish origin, and he had a Russian mother. He had been through all the horrors of the situation in the Balkans. He had come to this country, he had lots of languages . . . he was a very awkward person socially, but he had a

spectacular mind. He wrote everything longhand. He knew Italian, and he was sent to Massenzia, and I think something happened there. Machteld never told me what happened; something happened between him and Kyle and that made him very bitter for some reason. He used to send me a card every now and then, and I would send him archaeological news and reprints, and then at one point he dropped completely out. He had several interviews, and I tried to recommend him for jobs. He was too unusual; he was not the standard American man, and I think this turned people off. They couldn't see what a mind he had. But he had one of the best minds I've ever taught, and I'm really sorry that I've lost track of him. But he's probably the only one I've really lost track of; I think I know where all of the others are.

SMITH: You have kept very close touch with Carlos Picón, even though you only taught him as an undergraduate.

RIDGWAY: Ah, but he was a spectacular undergraduate. You know, it was so funny. Haverford had this program for supposedly underprivileged people, and because he was from Puerto Rico they thought that he would be underprivileged. So they were having these students come around and be exposed to professors and classes before the academic year began and a group came to my office to hear about archaeology. Here was this kid who was breathing archaeology—not so much archaeology but art. He immediately started off; he didn't want to take the introductory course, he started with Roman art. I said to him, "You cannot take an

advanced course in Roman art, you have to go through the other courses." He said, "No, I can do it, I can do it." Not only could he do it, he did it very well. Then when he decided to major in archaeology he had to go back and take the introductory course because he hadn't taken it, and it was a requirement. He was really unbelievable. He had this kind of excitement in front of a piece of sculpture that is the same kind of excitement I have.

When he wrote his honors paper—and again that was a topic that I suggested, but he did a spectacular job—I thought that it was publishable. We published it in *AJA*. A month later an article by a prominent German archaeologist came out in *Antike Plastik* using the same theory, saying the very same things, completely independent. But here was a boy who was doing it as an honors paper. He was a senior. He knew so much that I said to him, "You cannot possibly fit into any American university because you would make such a nuisance of yourself." He would have said, "Oh, we did this at Bryn Mawr in the introductory class," or, "This I knew from such and such." So I said the only place where he could really go was England, because there you have the tutorial system, and the tutorial system allows you to move at your own pace.

He went to England, we managed to get some fellowships for him, and I think he did very well there. Then from there I was worried that he was getting too trapped in the antiquarian line, because he worked for a dealer in rare books, or something

like that, and I thought that with his talent he should be a teacher. Instead, I think because of his British training, he went into museums. He came back to work at the San Antonio Museum with the Denman collection, and then from there he went to the Metropolitan. I keep in touch up to a point you know, because he is enormously busy, and I am enormously busy, but we know that we are there for each other.

SMITH: Another student of yours, whom you just had as an undergraduate but who then had the beginnings of a very brilliant career was Charles Edwards.

RIDGWAY: Oh don't talk about Charles Edwards; that kills me still. He was such a good person. A good person; he wasn't just a very good archaeologist. I think in sculpture he would have been fantastic; I think he was doing major work at Corinth. He was such fun. I don't know if you read one of his obituaries: they talk about how he would give a report at the school and then he would hug a statue! That is my kind of person, really. There was a very peculiar incident that happened with him. I recommended him very strongly when he finished his BA degree (at Haverford College); I wanted him to go and study with Eve Harrison, because it was so clear that he was a sculpture person, but they didn't accept him at the Institute of Fine Arts. He went to work at a Chinese restaurant.

I really wanted to know why they hadn't accepted this brilliant man, and they said, "Oh, but because there were so many 'B's in his transcript." I said, "What do you mean, 'B's in his transcript?" So I got a copy of his transcript, and at that time,

Haverford indicated a course taken at Bryn Mawr with "B" for Bryn Mawr. So they never looked at all the "A"s that he had. Well, I made Haverford change the way to indicate Bryn Mawr, so now they do BMC, so that nobody can think that that is a "B" grade. I raised the roof on that, and so the year after, NYU accepted him, and Eve Harrison thought the world of him. He was doing so well at Corinth, he really had a fantastic eye for sculpture. When we heard that he had AIDS we started sending him jokes and cards; we thought of him a lot. He joked until the very end; he said it was so useful to have things like this happen, because then you really find out how much your friends like you. It was very painful to have him die so young. He and Carlos were together in class. Can you imagine a class with the two of them sitting next to each other? He wrote his honors paper on the Peiraeus Apollo.

I can tell you all the honors papers that everybody wrote because I remember them. There was a girl who had her honors paper published in *AJA* right away; she did a Palmyrene head in the Bryn Mawr museum. Undergraduates had to have a certain average to do an honors paper, and there was one girl, Elizabeth T. Wakeley, who just didn't have the average, even though I thought she was good enough to do an honors paper. There was a head at Penn that I thought was a Greek original and not a Roman work, so she wrote a paper on it. She couldn't write an honors paper because she wasn't entitled, but she did it as an independent unit. I thought it was good enough to be published, and of course Penn said, "No, only if you do it jointly

with her, because we don't want an unknown to publish our piece." So it came out as a joint article, but basically she had done the work, and I hope it showed. I perhaps wrote it a little bit better. I am still in touch with her, I went to her son's wedding a few months ago.

SMITH: We did want to ask you about the hiring of Gloria Pinney and the changes in the Bryn Mawr faculty that begin to happen at that time. I don't know if it was because of her.

RIDGWAY: Well, actually, when she came it wasn't so much a change, because we really needed to replace Kyle, who at that time was the director of the center at Massenzia. So we needed somebody who could do Etruscan and vase painting, and she was perfect—and she could do Roman. At the beginning it was a temporary appointment, year by year. But immediately it was apparent that it was a very good appointment, that she really was very imaginative, very strong in her classics. She had a degree from Italy and a degree from an American university. Her Ph.D. was from Cincinnati. Actually, she had done much more than I had done in terms of the Italian university, because she had studied with Bianchi Bandinelli in Rome. She really had had a thorough training in archaeology, and then she had done the American Academy in Rome specialization. So she really came with an Italian degree that had a lot more archaeology in it than mine. She also had a strong background in the classics. So that was very important, too. She was very good in Etruscan because of

her training with Bianchi Bandinelli, and I think the vase painting developed mostly in Cincinnati, where she was with Cedric Boulter. She had all sorts of ideas about vase painting. So she fitted like a glove, and it was a very good appointment. So it wasn't so much a change, it was a question that as long as Kyle was in Italy and we needed a replacement she was the right person.

When eventually it was decided to terminate Kyle's appointment, then we reopened the issue, but she was obviously a very strong candidate, and we much enjoyed her. I must say I was devastated when she left, because I thought that she should have stayed. She was being killed by the fact that she had taken over the chairmanship. You see, I had grown into the chairmanship, because with Machteld being away so often, I was the unofficial chairman for years in that department. When Machteld was there full force she would make the major decisions, but I was the undergraduate adviser, I was the graduate adviser, and the students were always coming to me. So I did a lot of the chairman's tasks, and I grew into them as the administration became more and more paper-bound, because this happens in all the administrations now.

When Gloria took the position, it really hit her like a ton of bricks. And she is the kind of person who is so conscientious that she doesn't get things done and move to the next task; she ruminates about problems, she thinks about them at night, and she hesitates, she consults, she does all sorts of things. I was a very efficient chairman

because I hated it so much that the moment something crossed my desk I got it out. So everybody thought, "Oh, look how efficient she is." I kept going through our accounts of the restricted funds that belonged to the department, and I always found mistakes. I always went to the treasurer with all my lists and said, "There is a mistake here, there is a mistake there." The woman said, "Would you want a job in the treasurer's office?" I said, "I hate finances. I couldn't tell you what my salary is because my husband does all of this, but this is the departmental money, so it scares me stiff." I looked at it with a microscope, but I hated every moment of it. But that gave the impression that I was a very good chairman.

Now, Gloria was more conscientious. As a result, she didn't have time for her research, and she was much more of a pure researcher than I am, and so she really felt that Chicago was much better because they gave her free time. But I was very sorry to see her leave, I think it was a very difficult moment for the students to see two of us go away at the same time. The students felt panicky: what is going to happen to us? Because, obviously, the new people didn't know them, and there are still a few of these transitional students. I think the fact that we have gone away means that these students really haven't finished as fast as they could have finished because we can't control it as much. I cracked the whip a lot, and I can't crack the whip anymore. So they are doing it in their own time, whereas I would have been foaming at the mouth, making them finish sooner.

LYONS: Did Gloria Pinney's interest in structural and semiotic approaches have an impact on the way you looked at things? Did you discuss that?

RIDGWAY: Well, it has made me look at it, because I understand what she is doing. As I said, she is the kind of person that can explain it in such a way that it makes sense to me. And so from this point of view I hope I have learned something. If any colleague impacted on me I would have said, really, Gloria did a great deal, and I have mentioned that. I am grateful for that, and we still exchange ideas every now and then. But by and large she is much more theoretical than I am. So I take from it what I can cope with.

[Tape VI, Side One]

SMITH: What about other faculty that have come to Bryn Mawr, I guess since the mid-seventies? It's probably not a very large department, but nonetheless.

RIDGWAY: (A department of archaeology with five full-time archaeologists is very large, actually. Usually, in larger classics or art history departments, you find two or three archaeologists *at most*, but usually only one or two.) If you mean contact with other colleagues, I particularly would want to go back to the time when there were the really big names, like Richmond Lattimore, in the Greek department, or Bob [Robert] Broughton, in the Latin department; they were wonderful people. They were figures of awe to me, but they were very kind, very open, very helpful. Mabel Lang, in the Greek department, has also been a help, even though you worry when

you go and see her because you don't know if she's going to bite you. But most of the times if you go there with a specific request she is very cooperative and she can work with you well. We always had a good relationship with the Greek department. Now we have even supervised some of the dissertations together. Christina Salowey's was a combined dissertation supervision; it was Greg Dickerson and I. And again, that is a case where I feel completely confident that if I hadn't cracked the whip she wouldn't have put her dissertation through. I am always the ogre, the one who says, "This is it, I'm putting my foot down. I won't recommend you again unless you have this finished by such and such a date." Which is in the students' interest; I wouldn't do it otherwise. I'm not doing it to be nasty. Let's see . . . the Latin department. Darby [Russell T.] Scott spends so much time in Rome that obviously there wasn't quite the same relationship, but, surely, yes, he was another very good person. He was a good friend of Gloria's before Gloria came to Bryn Mawr; they knew each other at the academy in Rome. Julia Gaisser is a major figure.

I have always had good relationships with my colleagues. The only problem is this: I am not a social or political animal. I relate very well with everybody, but I don't have time. Usually, my life has been really pretty tight, and if I have time I'd rather spend it with my husband. So, for instance, they had these interdepartmental discussion groups on theoretical problems, but I never went because I really felt I could use my time more profitably in other ways. I never tried to belong to factions, I

never tried to push for certain things. I went to faculty meetings and spoke my mind, and I think in a way people appreciated the fact that I didn't belong to any group, because they knew that I would be my own person. I never could play the game, because it didn't interest me.

SMITH: But certainly there's a common perception, and David Lodge's novels play off of this, that academia is as much based on political factionalism and social networking as doing your work. How true is that?

RIDGWAY: Well, as far as I am concerned, it is not true at all, because certainly politics played no part whatsoever in what happened to me. Also, I think probably at Bryn Mawr it was less true than in other places. Whether it was lack of awareness on my part or whether it was an actual fact, I could not tell you, because there are some people who will tell you that at Bryn Mawr there are certain groups that control the situation. I don't think so, but I certainly have never been part of any group, nor was I ever asked to be part of any group, and therefore I lived happily ever after.

SMITH: But when people talk of the "Ridgway Rangers" spreading out across the country—

RIDGWAY: I think that they thought of that in terms of people who criticize concepts of sculpture; that is to say, people who didn't take anything for granted, who were trying to say something different about an object, but not in terms of anything else, no.

SMITH: So Bryn Mawr is not a social or political network?

RIDGWAY: It is in the sense that if you are from Bryn Mawr and you meet another Bryn Mawr person, you already automatically can take for granted that you have a certain background in common, and certain principles in common. Bryn Mawr people help one another. I have always done things for the Bryn Mawr alumnae, because they are so intelligent, they are so stimulating. It really is such fun to go places with a Bryn Mawr alumnae group, even though I might not know any one of them. I know the kind of person I am going to meet. So there is this kind of Bryn Mawr contact, and I have often told students who go someplace to get in touch with the alumnae there; they will be a support group.

I was in Denmark and I met with a lot of Bryn Mawr alumnae there. They started talking to each other, they completely ignored me, because everybody was comparing notes. They loved getting together. We had a meeting of all the Bryn Mawr alumnae in Paris, because I was there for three days. We had to throw them out of the house eventually because they had such a good time staying there, they didn't want to go away. I think there is a Bryn Mawr network from this point of view, undoubtedly, but not in the sense of favoritism.

LYONS: What about the relationships with the art history department? Were there any formal ties or jointly organized courses or collaborations?

RIDGWAY: No, not so much in my days. I think there is a lot more now, especially

because Alice went to the Institute of Fine Arts, so I think they think of her as an art historian. They never thought of me as an art historian. Charles Mitchell was a good friend. He liked my work, and he and I discussed things sometimes. But I think the others didn't feel that way. Gloria did a seminar with Dale Kinney, and that was very nice, but otherwise, whenever I did a joint seminar, it usually was with another archaeologist, not with people outside the department.

LYONS: What about Phyllis Bober?

RIDGWAY: Phyllis Bober is a wonderful woman. She was part of both departments. In some cases her knowledge of archaeology is much better than mine. She has had more field experience. She excavated at Samothrace, and she published some of the Samothrace material in the Bollingen series. She can extend antiquity to the Renaissance, which gives her a completely different perspective. But Phyllis Bober is a completely different case. You cannot say Phyllis Bober is art history; she is both art history and archaeology. She was the graduate dean, and she is really very much her own person. She is going to come here, to Florida State, and take Oleg Grabar's chair next year. So that's great.

SMITH: We have talked about this a little bit before, but stylistic analysis has been an important part of art-historical methodology, and it has been essential in your work. How would you have written your articles had you been in an art history department, instead of an archaeology department, taking into account that you are still working

from a stylistic point of view?

RIDGWAY: Maybe the question I answered just before might give you a clue: the art historians at Bryn Mawr never thought of me as an art historian, and they never wanted to have anything to do with me. Maybe they find me too simplistic. Maybe they don't feel that I am grounded in theory enough. They never thought of me as an art historian. It's only the outside world that might think of me as an art historian. I don't think of myself as an art historian, I think of myself as an archaeologist. I don't know whether that answers the question, but I don't know that my articles would have been written any differently. Maybe I would have learned more from the art historians, but, somehow, I don't know that I understand them. I have read some of the works by Steven [Z.] Levine, and that is not the kind of work that I can do. But of course, he has so much more information. He is talking about painters that lived a hundred years ago; you have the newspapers, you can tell who lived in the same house, who lived next door, who lived across the street. I even said it in one of my works: I was so baffled at this Ph.D. exam when the candidate was asked not only where the painter lived but who lived across the street from him. My word, I don't even know when my artist even existed!

SMITH: I know we've been talking about theory, but there are other areas, such as plain old-fashioned political and social history, in which a lot of work has been done in the last thirty years. You have a lot of sensitivity as to how your pieces fit into a

religious context, not in terms of a theoretical perspective but just as a way of thought and practical information. What have been the books in political or social or religious history of the classical world that have been important to you in helping you think through the archaeological problem?

RIDGWAY: I am afraid I am going to disappoint you. You will think after you've finished with all these tapes that I am a great failure. I didn't have time to do all of this. I only had time to keep abreast of my archaeological field, which I understood in a very large sense, because even though I wrote in only one area, I did take in Egypt and Mesopotamia and prehistory. I went to all the lectures that were in my larger field, and I learnt from all of them, and when I researched a topic, I made sure that I read around the topic, but to say, "I'm going to read books on religious philosophy ," no.

SMITH: Well, for instance, was Walter Burkert's work on Greek religion important to you?

RIDGWAY: I have read some parts of *Homo Necans* and I don't find it that influential for me. I have heard Burkert speak. I don't find the book to my own taste. I find that I can think of examples in a material sense that contradict some of the things he says, because I know more objects and he knows more theory.

SMITH: I don't know that it's theory per se as much as just concept.

RIDGWAY: I enjoy Froma [I.] Zeitlin, for instance; I have gone to hear some of the

lectures that she gives. I try to follow-up a little bit on the literature, but I always find that people in literature go too far from what I consider possible. So some of it is my limitation, obviously.

SMITH: No, it doesn't have to be viewed one way or the other. You have your body of material that you work with. It's just that a new approach to the political history of Greece might affect the way in which you then look at the objects.

RIDGWAY: I don't know. I know that indirectly Alice Donohue, with her historiography, has had an impact on me, and I know that she considers the type of archaeology that I do useless. I can admire what she does, though I don't know that I would do it. She gave a seminar on "The Monument." I would never be able to do anything that abstract, even though she might bring it down to details. I actually wrote a review of [Philip P.] Fehl's book on the monument [*The Classical Monument: Reflections on the Connection between Morality and Art in Greek and Roman Sculpture*]. That was interesting, because Carpenter had been given that book to review, and he said, "I can't review this, you review it." I almost felt that I couldn't review it either. So from this point of view I think that I maybe have inherited something from Carpenter, I don't know. But I have to start from something concrete, like architectural sculpture, then I can rise above that and ask, "What makes it monumental," or, "What is the conception of a monument?" But I cannot do it the other way around.

SMITH: Well, yes, but it's a two-way street; the ways in which people are discussing Greek religion differently today than they did fifty years ago affects the way you think of objects as religious objects used in certain places.

RIDGWAY: Surely. I have been reading some Swedish publications, on religion. Also, if there is a person that I enjoy very much it's Folkert van Straten. I think he is such a character, I particularly enjoy his work. But then again, notice that the person I pick is van Straten over Burkert, because he is much more concrete.

LYONS: Is this van Straten the one who writes on ancient medical history?

RIDGWAY: Well, he has also done that, but he has looked into why the Greeks kneeled in front of their gods. He has done an article, for instance, "Dedications After a Dream," and he has a book that just came out now called *Hiera kala*, on the issue of sacrifices. I have read several of his works, and I was even at a symposium with him. He is a tall, lugubrious-looking person, but he has a sense of humor that is absolutely fantastic.

SMITH: Just starting from the objects and keeping to the objects alone, does your work have something to say to other historians who are working on the question of sacrifice? Given the objects we have, we know that sacrifices could not have involved this, or must have involved that.

RIDGWAY: Well, I had one revelation at the Pergamon altar on a recent trip to Berlin, and I should have known it all along. I want to tell Andrew Stewart about

this, I can't wait until he comes back from Greece. The traditional interpretation is that it's an altar of Zeus and Athena, but it could not possibly have been an altar of Zeus and Athena, because you would never have been able to get cattle up those steps. So whatever else it was, it was not an altar of Zeus and Athena, because you could not have given the traditional sacrifices there. If the altar was for Zeus and Athena, there must have been entirely different types of sacrifices, but usually you do sacrifice cattle to both Zeus and Athena. You could have never got them up those steps; I could barely go up the steps now at my age. The first time I saw the Pergamon altar I guess I was young and I ran up and down and I thought nothing of it. This time I was laboring over those steps.

SMITH: They couldn't have had a ramp somewhere?

RIDGWAY: They don't, that's the whole point, they don't have a ramp, whereas on the Acropolis they do have a ramp. I don't believe it's an altar to begin with. Andrew Stewart thinks it *is* an altar, though not of Zeus and Athena. It sort of hit me that it couldn't be; you cannot bring the animals up to the sacrificial table. You cannot carry a bull. So you see how religion comes into it in a very practical way!

LYONS: In the field of classical sculpture, among the younger generation, who do you feel are the people who are making important contributions? One name that we haven't talked about is Carol [C.] Mattusch.

RIDGWAY: Yes, oh yes. I said from the beginning that her books on bronzes are

very important, and so are her ideas on originals and copies—how you have a single model, then you adapt it for a variety of things. I think Carol Mattusch is great. She was one of our undergraduates, you know. She got her Ph.D. from Chapel Hill. Mark [Fullerton], no question. He has a terrific mind; I think he's doing very, very important work. I think Mary Sturgeon is doing some interesting work. Her work now has been primarily on reconstructing the program of the reliefs in the theater at Corinth, but on this she has brought to bear all sorts of things. In the process, she has reconstructed three statues that were really fragmentary, all over the place; you should see what she got out of what was literally a marble pile. So she is doing very good work. A person who has a very good mind but publishes little is Anne Weis, and I am sorry because that woman knows so much. She's all into teaching and into reading, but you'd probably have to point a gun to make her write. And yet when she finally writes, she writes something very important.

LYONS: Among your international colleagues, such as the Greeks, who are some of the people doing major work? Olga Palagia is someone you mentioned earlier.

RIDGWAY: Olga Palagia is good. I don't completely agree with many of her theories, but I think she is quite good. I like Ismeni Triantis; she has been doing a lot of very nice work. And of course Georgios Despinis has a wonderful eye for sculpture. I like Tonio Hölscher's work, I think he's very good. And Erika Simon of course. I like John Boardman. I think he has become more inclusive now because he

has even taken in Magna Graecian. I find that he has the ability to say something very concisely and yet in a pithy way, so that it really makes a point. I wrote this book on the fourth century, and then when it was all finished and in press, I got his fourth-century book. I put in all the page references, and I'm sorry that I couldn't acknowledge it, but I found that many of the things that I said in pages and pages, he had said in half a sentence, but I could see where he was coming from. We had come somewhat to the same conclusions. I am perhaps a little bit less minimalist than he is. Geoffrey B. Waywell I think is very good, and I'm sorry again that we don't have more from him. There are people who are doing good work in sculpture.

Christa Landwehr I think is good, and unfortunately I don't think the Germans are giving her enough credit for the kinds of ideas she has, and that's too bad. Adolf Borbein has some good critical insights. Peter Bol can be very good. He is in Frankfurt, and he has done several catalogs. He worked originally on the bronzes and the sculptures from the Antikythera shipwreck, then he published the bronzes from Olympia. But then he has primarily been working with material from Frankfurt and some of the Italian collections. Let's see . . . who else? There aren't that many people in pure sculpture, you know, who would really write in a sustained way on sculpture. The French archaeologist, [Jean] Marcadé is really good, but he has never really done the work on Delos. His book on Delos is the most stimulating and the most frustrating book you could ever use.

Andrew Stewart is very good for bringing in theory, history, literature, and background. I would say not quite as good on individual objects, but that is purely my own opinion. Eve Harrison: it's too bad that she never came out with the other catalogs from the Agora, because her catalog of archaic is a model; it's a must book to read, so it's a shame that she didn't do the other books. Among the Swiss, [Ernst] Berger does some good things in sculpture. But who am I to pass judgment on these people? You know, I haven't read everything that they have written. I have read a lot of what they have written but not everything. And automatically I will say, "Oh, he doesn't see it the way I see it, therefore he can not be that important," so that's not a valid assessment at all. It's a very subjective kind of thing.

SMITH: There are a few little things on your vita that I wanted to explore a little bit. You were a consultant for the Turkish department of antiquities. Have you done other things of that nature?

RIDGWAY: No, no. Again, I have answered questions over the phone, but that's it.

SMITH: You also have been a consultant for the National Endowment for the Humanities.

RIDGWAY: Yes, I was on several panels.

SMITH: How has that worked? Do you think the NEH has been a positive thing for the archaeology field?

RIDGWAY: It's very funny, because I was actually on two art history panels, which

was really surprising, but one of course had a lot of architecture. The committee would have thrown out Dinsmoor Jr.'s early Propylon on the Athenian Akropolis, and I really was overwhelmed that they wouldn't consider something like that important, especially since he was publishing some of the notes from his father that nobody would have had access to otherwise. But they were looking at the whole range of architecture, going all the way down to mission architecture and all these kinds of things. So I think sometimes the proposals go to the wrong place. They have sent me a lot of proposals on excavations, and I always express an opinion on whether I think the site is important, if I know the person, and so on.

But the panels have always been primarily art history. Again, I don't think that it is quite fair to use archaeological works or proposals within the context of art history. When I asked for an NEH grant for my *Roman Copies*, the criticism came back that the subject was too narrow. I thought that the subject was too wide! I was really hesitant even in approaching a subject like that, because I thought it was too enormous, and the criticism was, "Yes, this is a respectable person, but the subject is too narrow." So it made me think that the persons who were judging it didn't know the subject, and from this point of view I don't know that the NEH can work best.

I was on a Fulbright panel (for five years), and there again there were some peculiarities. For instance, there was a person who was convinced that if an American student applied to go to the school in Athens that wasn't a valid enough

project. The person had to have a completely different project. We were saying, "No, when you want to send them to Greece you don't want them to have a firm project, because then they are not open to all the possibilities; you want them to have the training of the School in Athens." This was absolutely not understood by the other persons of the panel, and I had to make little speeches every time.

So some of these committees work well only insofar as the people on them know what they are talking about, or are willing to listen to other people on the panel who know what they are talking about. In this one instance, one man on the panel voted against all projects for the American School in Athens after I had made three speeches and I had even called in the lady who was the supervisor to tell him, "Yes, we do accept projects of people who just want to go to the American School in Athens."

SMITH: Archaeology in many respects is a model interdisciplinary subject. I would think probably the large majority of academic archaeologists are not in archaeology departments, but they're in classics, or anthropology—

RIDGWAY: Yes, I know. Bryn Mawr is a little bit unusual that way.

SMITH: But also I'm hearing from you that archaeology doesn't necessarily fare so well in interdisciplinary environments.

RIDGWAY: I don't know. Some people think that it does. I know that there are some colleagues of mine who have felt that they have gained from being members of

the art history department. Kim Hartswick, for instance, fits in perfectly well. And there are people who fit very well in classics departments. And there are cases, like Anne Weis or Gloria Pinney, of people who are in two departments. The point is that very often that means that you fall in between two stools; that is an inherent danger when you are a member of more than one department. I was privileged that I was really with the department of archaeology.

I know that Boston University does world archaeology, and I don't know how much the students really get out of that, because they can be spread so thin that they might not have what I would consider a really firm grounding in one subject. You cannot be taught everything. You can be taught how to work, and as long as you have a certain basic understanding of methodology, and a certain professional integrity that says, "I'm going to check this, I'm going to go to the original sources, I'm not going to read just a compendium," then you will be able to go into certain fields on your own.

I don't know that one can do world archaeology and teach at such a general level that archaeology is archaeology no matter where it is. This was actually Colin Renfrew's theory, that if it is an island polity, it's an island polity, whether it's in the Cyclades or in the Bahamas. Well, I don't believe it for a minute. Now I probably express it in a very simplistic way, and he probably wouldn't defend this position at all; he would say he never said that, but this is how it was popularized, so to speak:

there are certain basic concepts that are inherent to the fact that you are on an island. But an island in the Pacific is very different from an island in the Aegean, and I cannot see that, because you are an islander, you are going to react the same way, so from this point of view I don't think that one can do world archaeology. But that is my own prejudice, and as a matter of fact I know it is a prejudice.

One thing that I didn't mention is that Dick Ellis, at Bryn Mawr, has done a lot of work with the anthropology department, and so has Jim [Wright]; they have team-taught courses. We also used to do courses on the growth and structure of cities, but there we were really more teaching our own courses, because we were doing ancient cities. But, of course, you were looking at cities as cities rather than just Delphi, or cities and sanctuaries, you know, the way it is normally done. You were also looking at concepts. There again, Dick Ellis, or Carl Nylander, or Jim were much better than I was, because I tended to give them the Greek side rather than the universal side.

SMITH: You have also been on the executive committee of the *Lexicon Iconographicum*.

RIDGWAY: Yes. Again, for what I could contribute. I stayed there as long as I thought that I could really contribute something. But it was very interesting, especially at the beginning when people were formulating policies. I think it's a great work that we have now. It's a major achievement by Lilly [Ghali] Kahil, because it really was due to her energy and vision and enthusiasm.

SMITH: I think I am coming to the end of my questions. I don't know if you want to pursue anything?

LYONS: What's the future for studies in ancient sculpture? Where is it heading? Where should it head? What are or will be some of the important questions?

RIDGWAY: I don't know. Questions come in writing, so I'm looking forward to doing these next two books. I know they are going to be very difficult, because they will pull me into Roman areas much more than the previous ones. I will have to try to take into account criticisms such as Mark Fullerton's, and all these other things. After that I don't know. Fred Kleiner asked me whether I will write an article for his last issue of *AJA*, because he thought that he wanted to have a special last issue, and I said I will think about it. I could write on the statue of Anakreon that everybody has always dated in the fifth century. I don't think it is fifth century. But, again, you know, it might very well be that if I write it Fred won't accept it because the reviewers will think it's off the wall. But that is one thing that I have to do.

I will also supervise the editing of papers for the fourth Langford Conference we had here, on Pergamon and Sperlonga. Together with Professor Nancy de Grummond, I will be responsible for looking over all the papers and preparing them for publication. I will have to take into account the comments that the readers will make on my Sather Lectures, and I will put that book into final shape for the press. I have a review for the *Bonner Jahrbücher*; it's a work by Nikolaus Himmelmann on

Sperlonga, which I was interested in. I have to write it, I haven't had a chance. So I know that I have very definite projects. I don't have a vision, if that's what you were asking.

LYONS: Well, certain work you may not ever be able to do. What about issues for future generations?

RIDGWAY: Future generations really should continue working with sculpture; that is my main concern, that it isn't left to languish because it's too "artsy." I hope that future generations will see what a tremendous manifestation of ancient culture sculpture is, that it is as powerful a medium as television is today, or our literature, and that therefore they should continue keeping it in mind and working with it. What amazes me is how little we know. Fifty years ago people thought they knew a lot more. Now I think we know that we don't know. So that seems to me very stimulating. I think underwater archaeology will be a very exciting area for recovering more sculpture. I think that there still is a great deal to be found. There are a lot of unsolved problems. Practically every report that I assign I say to the student, "This is a problem." And I don't know that we have solutions yet.

SMITH: By "problem" you mean the problem of dating, or the problem of use?

RIDGWAY: Everything, even the problem of interpretation: what does it mean?

SMITH: The iconographic interpretation?

RIDGWAY: What message it was meant to give, not so much iconography. We

know that the Nike of Samothrace connotes victory, but people who say that the monument is Rhodian have no grounds to say that it is Rhodian. The student who was in my office this morning has been trying to promote another identification, because she thinks she can connect it with Phillip V, and I think that is very good, but she said to me, "I can't find any proof." I said, "Well, join the club. You can't find proof, so you'll have to wait." I told her to try and go to the excavations at Samothrace so that she could become more acquainted with these things, but she won't find any proof: it could be Ptolemaic, it could be Macedonian, it could be something else. If it is a Macedonian monument, it's a completely different message from the Rhodian monument that everybody has taken for granted.

One of the reasons people think it is a Rhodian monument is because the base is in Rhodian marble. But the statue is in Parian marble: you don't tell me therefore that it is a Parian monument. They say, "Yes, but Rhodian marble was not exported." But it was exported if you wanted a dark color. Also, the date has been based on a comparison with the Pergamon Altar. If the date of the Pergamon Altar comes down, is the date of the Nike going to come down, or is it going to remain the same? So, you see, there are all sorts of interconnections. The message can be completely different: as long as we read it as a Rhodian message, we have a completely different understanding.

And Sperlonga. I think Sperlonga has been a bombshell; it has made us

reexamine everything. I also think that the exhibition on the Mahdia shipwreck has been an enormous eye-opener for our studies of sculpture. In the last fifty years there have been a number of discoveries—the Riace warriors, the Sperlonga sculptures, the Mahdia shipwreck reconsidered, the Motya Youth—which have really rocked us back on our heels and made us realize we know so very little. I think it's important that we continue working with these things.

INDEX

American Academy (Rome), 128–129, 220
American Journal of Archaeology (*AJA*), 176–187, 198–204
American School of Classical Studies at Athens, 29, 34, 36, 43, 45, 48, 66, 97, 100, 110, 204, 208, 210, 211, 237
Archaeological Institute of America (AIA), 62, 98, 176, 182–183, 184, 187, 188–189, 192, 199–204
Archaic Style in Greek Sculpture, The, 96, 137, 138, 205–206
Ashmead, Ann Harnwell, 28, 29, 30, 43
Athena Parthenos (replica in Nashville, Tenn.), 117–121
Auth, Susan Handler, 59

Badian, Ernst, 108–109
Bandinelli, Ranuccio Bianchi, 22, 220, 221
Bass, George F., 174
Becatti, Giovanni, 22, 23
Berger, Ernst, 235
Bieber, Margarete, 33, 113, 127–128
Boardman, John, 173, 234
Bober, Phyllis, 227
Bodner, Father Edward W., 111
Bol, Peter, 234
Bonacasa, Nicola, 100
Bookidis, Nancy, 58, 101, 205–206
Borbein, Adolf, 234
Borza, Eugene, 207
Bothmer, Dietrich von, 132, 188
Boulter, Cedric G., 103, 221
Boulter, Patricia Neils, 189
Brancusi, Constantin, 163
Broughton, Robert, 223
Burkert, Walter, 229, 231
Buschor, Ernst, 42

Calder, William M., 202
Cambitoglou, Alexander, 15, 91
Carpenter, Rhys, 15, 21, 23–26, 28, 37–38, 40, 41, 47, 49, 54, 98, 102–103, 113, 115, 129, 155, 164–165, 230
Caskey, John, 29, 36
Caskey, Lacey Davis, 29
Center for Advanced Study in the Visual Arts (CASVA), 112
Childs, William A.P., 179
Connelly, Joan B., 149–152
Conticello, Baldassare, 176
Cotsen, Lloyd, 82

Despinis, Georgios, 136, 233
Dickerson, Gregory, 224
Dinsmoor, William B.,Sr., 36, 41, 101, 118
Di Vita, Antonino, 99
Donohue, Alice A., 178, 202, 208, 210, 227, 230
Ducati, Pericle, 22–23
Dyson, Stephen L., 181

Edwards, Charles, 218–219
Eiseman, Cynthia Jones, 174
Ellis, Richard, 54, 239
Ervin, Miriam, 29, 30

Fehl, Philip P., 230
Fiandra, Enrica, 99

Fifth Century Styles in Greek Sculpture, 113, 137, 138
Flashar, Hellmut, 181
Fleischer, Robert, 56
Fourth Century Styles in Greek Sculpture, 95–96, 139, 140
Frel, Jirí, 188, 189, 193–194, 197
Fuchs, Michaela, 126
Fuchs, Werner, 106
Fullerton, Mark, 126, 208, 210–211, 233, 240
Furtwängler, Adolf, 146

Gaisser, Julia, 224
German Archaeological Institute (Athens), 96
Getty Kouros, 132–137, 142–143, 188–189
Gowing, Lawrence, 112
Grabar, Oleg, 227
Graziani, Rodolfo, 12
Grummond, Nancy de, 240
Grunauer, Peter, 196
Gwatkin, William E., 37

Hanfmann, George M.A., 37, 145
Hanson, Anne Coffin, 50–51, 86
Harrison, Evelyn, 49–50, 95, 101, 115–117, 135, 145, 150, 218–219, 235
Hartswick, Kim J., 211–212, 238
Herz, Norman, 135, 213
Hill, Bert Hodge, 36
Himmelmann, Nikolaus, 42, 93, 241
Hölscher, Tonio, 234
Holtzmann, Bernard, 136
Homann-Wedeking, Ernst, 136–137
Hood, William, 144
Hornum, Michael, 214
Houghton, Arthur, 195
Humphrey, John H., 126, 182–183

Institute for Advanced Study (Princeton), 34, 90, 106, 137–138
Italian Institute of Culture, 35, 99, 100
Italian School of Archaeology (Athens), 35, 48–49, 99, 100

Jacopi, Giulio, 16–18, 22, 46–47, 97
Jerome, Thomas Spencer (Lectures), 47, 128–129, 130

Kahil, Lilly Ghali, 240
Kane, Susan, 212–213
Kinney, Dale, 227
Kleemann, Ilse, 134, 136
Kleiner, Fred S., 146, 180–181, 240
Knoblauch, Anne Marie, 214
Kosmopoulou, Angeliki, 214
Kozloff, Arielle, 195
Krahmer, Gerhard, 113
Kyrieleis, Helmut, 96–97

Lamb, Winifred, 201
Landwehr, Christa, 234
Lang, Mabel, 65–66, 224
Langlotz, Ernst, 188–189
Lapatin, Kenneth Shapiro, 204
Lattimore, Richmond, 30, 223
Lavagnini, Bruno, 100
Laviosa, Clelia, 99
Leipen Neda, 117
Levi, Doro, 47–48, 100
Levine, Stephen Z., 228
Levy, Leon, 191, 196
Lombardi, Margherita (sister), 4, 6, 7, 12, 31, 45, 170
Lombardo, Maria (mother), 1, 4, 5–6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12–14, 15, 20, 53–54, 67, 107

Luckner, Kurt, 195

Macrì, Giacomo, 19
Marcadé, Jean, 234–235
Marconi, Clemente, 147
Marvin, Miranda, 58
Mattusch, Carol C., 131–132, 232–233
Mazzarino, Santi, 17
McBride, Katharine, 52, 58, 67, 70, 84, 90
McPherson, Mary Patterson, 172
Mellink, Machteld, 15, 23, 26, 27–28, 33–34, 37–38, 48, 51–54, 57, 60–62, 66, 67, 70, 72, 79, 90, 98, 167, 178, 185, 187, 205, 209–210, 216, 221
Meritt, Lucy Shoe, 101, 207
Métraux, Guy P.R., 145
Michelangelo, 163
Miller, Stella, 207–208, 210
Millon, Henry A., 112–113
Mitchell, Charles, 144, 227
Moens, Luc, 135
Moon, Warren G., 189, 202
Müller, Valentin, 29
Mussolini, Benito, 8

National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH), 235–236
Nylander, Carl, 42, 46, 54, 56, 106, 165, 239

Owen, David, 174

Page, Denys L., 30
Palagia, Olga, 129, 152, 233
Payne, Humfry, 24, 102
Pelagatti, Paola, 99
Pendlebury, J.D.S., 28
Phillips, Kyle Meredith, Jr., 34, 46, 54, 65–66, 165–170, 171, 206, 207, 209, 216, 220, 221
Picón, Carlos, 102–103, 191, 192, 195, 216–218, 219
Pinney, Gloria Ferrari, 56, 64–65, 82, 129, 142, 146–147, 148, 149, 150, 212, 220–223, 224, 227, 238
Pollitt, J.J., 110
Poulson, Vagn, 109
Pritchard, James B., 162–163
Pritchett, W. Kendrick, 36–37

Raubitschek, Antony E., 24
Reilly, Joan, 148–149
Renfrew, Colin, 238–239
Riace bronzes, 130–132
Richter, Gisela M.A., 155–156, 174, 175–176, 203
Ridgway, Christopher (son), 76, 78–80, 82, 160
Ridgway, Conrad (son), 74–75, 82
Ridgway, Eric (son), 75, 80–81, 82
Ridgway, Henry W., Jr. (husband), 3, 12, 18, 30–31, 50, 51, 53, 58, 61–63, 68, 72–73, 76, 81, 137, 160
Ridgway, Kevin (son), 75–76, 79, 81, 82, 107
Robinson, Henry, 211
Rockwell, Peter, 136
Roman Copies of Greek Sculpture: The Problem of the Originals, 128–129, 236
Rotolo, Vincenzo, 99, 101

Salowey, Christina, 224
Sather Classical Lectures, 81, 99, 139, 140, 215, 241
Schaeffer, Judith, 142

Schliemann, Heinrich, 202
Scott, Russell T., 224
Segre, Mario, 17
Settis, Salvatore, 147
Severe Style in Greek Sculpture, The, 90, 106, 109–110, 113, 138
Simon, Erika, 173, 234
Sismondo, Giuseppe (father), 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 11, 14–16, 20
Sjöqvist, Erik, 58
Stech, Tamara, 178, 181–182, 198
Stevens, Gorham Phillips, 36
Stewart, Andrew, 147–148, 152–154, 232, 235
Stillwell, Richard, 58, 179, 186
Straten, Folkert van, 231
Sturgeon, Mary C., 215, 233
Swindler, Mary, 177
Szeliga, George, 215–216

Thompson, Homer, 90, 106, 152, 159–160, 179
Todisco, Luigi, 146
Touchette, Lori-Ann, 126
Triantis, Ismeni, 233
Triantis, Stelios, 136
True, Marion, 195

Vanderpool, Eugene, 36
Vermeule, Cornelius, 15, 191–192
Vitelli, Karen D., 189

Wace, Alan, 201
Wakeley, Elizabeth T., 219–220
Walsh, John, 191
Waywell, Geoffrey B., 234
Weis, Harriet Anne, 215, 233, 238
White, Donald, 206
White, Shelby, 196
Winckelmann, Johann Joachim, 202
Winter, Nancy, 206
Wiseman, James, 61–62
World War II, 2–3, 4–8, 10, 11–12, 34, 79–80, 84
Wright, James C., 209, 239

Young, Rodney, 34, 57

Zeitlin, Froma I., 230